Some Farther

REMARKS

ON THE LATE

ACCOUNT

Given by Dr. *TENISON*

OF HIS

Conference with Mr. *PULTON.*

Wherein the Doctor's Three Exceptions againſt EDWARD MEREDITH are Examined, Several of his other Miſrepreſentations laid open, Motives of the ſaid *E. M.*'s Converſion ſhewed, and ſome other Points relating to Controverſie *occaſionally* treated.

TOGETHER WITH

An *Appendix*, in which ſome Paſſages of the Doctor's Book entituled, Mr. Pulton Conſidered, are *Re-conſidered*; and *in the Cloſe* the beſt Means of coming to true Faith propoſed.

To all which is added,

A *Poſtſcript* in Anſwer to the Pamphlet put forth by the School-Maſter of *Long-Acre.*

Ego injuriantem novi, & ſuſtinentem.

Publiſhed with Allowance.

LONDON:

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Moſt Excellent Majeſty, for His Houſhold and Chappel; And are to be ſold at his Printing-houſe on the Ditch-ſide in *Black-Fryers.* 1688.

REMARKS

ON THE LATE

PROCLAMATION

To the Readers.

YOu are inform'd at the beginning of the following Diſcourſe what Accident engag'd me in it. And ſince (as you will perceive) it was not Choice but Neceſſity, I have a Title to your favorable peruſal. When perſons offer themſelves at the Bar for the Defence of Others, it is expected they ſhould be Eloquent (that is) qualified for ſuch an Undertaking: but when a man is brought thither to plead for himſelf, it is enough if he come with Sincerity, and an intelligible Expreſſion.

Again, if outward Objects have ſo much influence on the Conceptions of the Mind, as they are believ'd to have on thoſe of the Body, you will not look for great matters in this Pamphlet, when you conſider not only my own Inability, but alſo what lay before my eyes whil'ſt I compos'd it: For certainly whatever Dr. Tenilon may have ſhewn himſelf in other Writings, theſe which have been the Subject of my Remarks do not challenge our admiration for their Excellence.

As for Method, I take that which is uſual in Remarks, by ſuffering my Author to lead me which way he pleaſes, and therefore whatever leaps I am forc'd to make from one Matter to another, muſt be attributed to thoſe Hedges and Ditches over which I am conducted by him. But to ſay the Truth, how unpleaſant ſoever theſe Incoherences may appear to the Reader, they were of no ſmall Convenience to me: For having no

time for this Task, but what was greatly interrupted both by Buſineſs *and* Sickneſs, *my Memory would hardly have ſerv'd me to have carried the Matter of any large and connected Diſcourſe through ſo many Intermiſſions, and ſuch variety of other thoughts, whereas this broken and incoherent Theme was (as it happen'd) very ſuitable to my leiſure.*

However, theſe Interruptions muſt apologize for that ſlowneſs wherewith this Pamphlet comes abroad; For tho' much time be paſt ſince Dr. Teniſon's *Books call'd on me (eſpecially the former) yet that which has been at my diſpoſal has not been much. Nay, on the contrary, it has been ſo little, that what comes forth with ſo much ſeeming deliberation, was really written in more haſt than my Forces (which have not been much exercis'd this way) could well comply with. And indeed had I not conſider'd that things of this nature grow out of ſeaſon like* Gazetts *and* Almanacs, *I ſhould have had ſo much reſpect for my Readers, as to have ſpent a few more hours in preparing for their Entertainment.*

The Doctor, whether it be to manifeſt the quickneſs of his Parts, or to ſhew us that his Pariſhioners are ſo * pious, *and ſo* * ſteddy, *that they need not the looking after, is very fruitful in ſuch Productions; but* Nobis non licet eſſe tam diſertis.

* Epiſt. to his Pariſhioners.

But altho' in the Method of this Diſcourſe (as I have intimated) I follow my Author, yet I do it not ſo cloſely, but that ſometimes I make a ſtand, and take a view of ſuch things as lie within proſpect. My thoughts have not been ſo wholly

buſied

buſied in vindicating my ſelf (as I have had occaſion to take notice of in ſome places of the following Paper) much leſs in annoying my Adverſary, that I have not conſider'd which way to benefit my Readers: And herein if I have treated of ſome things which may ſeem beneath the Dignity of the Preſs, (for I have attended in my choice more to ordinary Converſations than to Books) I hope it may paſs without Cenſure. For ſince all higher Points are already ſufficiently diſcuſs'd by Learned Pens, I am not to be blamed if I chooſe ſome of thoſe which are not only more proportionable to my ſtrength, but alſo may be taken up with leſs Preſumption, for having been rejected by better Writers as not worth their while.

And yet, had theſe matters which I here ſpeak of been only the peculiar Extravagances of ſome over-ſtrain'd Fancy, they might, and ought perhaps to have been contemn'd: But when ſuch trivial things (if you will call them ſo) are daily both ſpoken with Confidence, and heard with Patience; nay, when oftentimes (at leaſt in outward ſhew) they are the ſole hindrances of Converſion, they ceaſe to be trivial; *and we muſt rectifie that* Idea, *which we have of them from the bare conſideration of their Nature, by weighing their Effects. A Chirurgeon is not ſo much to attend to the prick of a Thorn, as to the Gangrene which poſſibly may have been cauſed by it.*

And now I will not deny but it is the greateſt of my Deſires that all my Proteſtant Readers might be Converted. They will not take this in ill part, when they know I firmly believe there is no other way for their Salvation. *However, what I ask of them at preſent is much* leſs, *and even what themſelves cannot*

not refuse, without pleasing me much better, viz. by changing their Religion. This will be no longer a Paradox, when I tell them, It is only that (for some time at least) they would be truly Protestants: My meaning is, That whereas they affirm, first, that their Faith is not to be pinn'd on another's Sleeve; and secondly, that none ought to pretend to Infallibility, they would now conform themselves to their own Principles, and consequently neither be so far enchanted by the Name or Reputation of their Teachers on the one side, as to take things from them without farther Examination, nor so far ty'd to their own Opinions on the other, as not to suspect them where they are contradicted by Men as Wise, as Learned, and (as far as may be guess'd by the exterior) as Good as themselves. This, I say, is all I ask of my Protestant Readers; and this (as I hinted) is nothing else in effect than that they would be Protestants. The Reformation it self was grounded on the first of these two Principles, and the second is a Natural Result from the first: For how could Christians have separated from their Church-Guides in order to a Reformation, had they not fancied an Obligation of Distrusting them? And having once (for the necessary justification of this Proceeding) denied Infallibility to these Guides, with what shadow of Modesty could they arrogate the same to themselves?

Nothing therefore is so primarily Essential to Protestants, as to conclude both Themselves and their Leaders Fallible, and in consequence of this to Distrust both. And from hence it follows (according to what I intimated before) that when they do otherwise (that is, absolutely confide in either) their Protestancy is at an end.

This

This in Truth is consonant to Reason, and therefore one would think that what I here ask were already granted. But alas! Reason was never more Pretended, nor less Used; and these Gentlemen are so far from having it in our present Case, that one Part of them, whil'st they decry all dependence on Men *for their Faith with the greatest impatience, repose so entirely on This, or the Other* Reverend Doctor, *or on Several of them together, that altho' these very Doctors * teach them the contrary, they are ready to* believe *them in every thing but this; and the Rest wondring at General Councils for* pretending to Infallibility, *talk in the mean while themselves with so much Authority, and so little Diffidence, as if they spoke by immediate Inspiration from Heaven.*

* By a necessary Consequence from their Doctrin, *viz.* That the Church is to be follow'd no farther than it agrees with Scripture, and each man is left to judge how far she so agrees.

This is what truly passes in the World; but this is notwithstanding what ought not to pass: For whatever Allowances may be made to Ignorance where men proceed according to the best of their Knowledge, *there is certainly no excuse for Protestants, whil'st they declare that both their Teachers and their own Judgments are liable to Error in Doctrins of Faith, if nevertheless they suffer themselves to be deceiv'd by either.*

Wherefore, my dear Friends, *I hope you will not say you may be mistaken, and yet act as if you could not; but that, reflecting on the Uncertainty which even your own Principles shew you to be in, you will do what so much danger naturally suggests, viz. have recourse to Almighty God, who is our*

only

only Refuge in all Diſtreſſes, earneſtly *and* conſtantly *beſeeching him, that ſince you cannot pleaſe him without Faith, nor have Faith whil'ſt you have Doubt, he would bring you to ſuch a Faith as may* rationally *exclude all Doubting, and ſo yield you a ſolid Foundation for both your Hope and Charity.*

This Reſolution of addreſſing your ſelves to God by humble Prayer is of ſo great moment, that tho' I could heartily wiſh that this *were now your Preparation of mind for the reading of this Pamphlet, yet I ſhould be very well contented if it ſhould prove the fruit of your Peruſal, and that when you made an end of* Reading, *you would be throughly convinced of the neceſſity of* Praying. *And it is for this reaſon that I make the ſame Requeſt to you once more in my* Cloſe. *And certainly I may well deſpair of obtaining any other favor from you, if after all my Entreaties you deny me What your own Teachers, your own Principles, and your own greateſt Intereſt asks of you as well as my ſelf.*

E. M.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Citations in the Margin refer to Dr. *T.*'s Account of the Conference, excepting where it is otherwiſe expreſs'd.

Page 15. line 22. for *Doctor himſelf*, read *Doctor and himſelf*. What other faults have eſcaped the Preſs are eaſily corrected.

Some

Some Farther

REMARKS

ON THE

Late Account, given by Dr. *Tenison* of his Conference with Mr. *Pulton*.

THERE are few perſons (I ſuppoſe) but ſuch as have a great conceit of themſelves, who are willing, that all the words which drop from them in the heat of a tumultuous and unprepared Diſcourſe, ſhould be Publiſhed through the preſent Age, or recommended to Poſterity; *at leaſt*, in no better dreſs, than the haſt they were ſpoken in would allow. But when ſuch caſual expreſſions, are not only diveſted of their Antecedent and Conſequent Circumſtances, but muſt bear the Additions and Defalcations of Craft and Malice over and aboye; nay, when a *Diſputing* Adverſary, not only takes care to Interrupt his Opponents Diſcourſe, and by that means renders his Propoſitions maim'd and imperfect; but alſo, when he has them at home, mangles them yet far-

ther, and in this plight (like a deform'd *Sampſon*) expoſes them to mockery; the injury is too great to need any other aggravation, than barely the being told. However, this Injuſtice is heighten'd, when to make theſe miſshapen Sentences of his Antagoniſt appear yet more ugly, his own are trimm'd up and placed by them with a far better Air in Print, than that which they had at the Conference.

And yet how provoking ſoever this injury may be, I call God to witneſs, that my own Reputation (tho' it ſuffer as far as either Dr. *Teniſons* Tongue, or Pen is a Slander) ſhould never have prevailed with me to have appeared in its Defence: Since (over and above the Repugnance I ſtill have to this kind of coming upon the Stage) it ought to be a greater comfort to a Chriſtian to bear an Affront with patience, than to enſure the Praiſe of the whole World. And thoſe who have been the moſt acquainted with the exerciſes of a vertuous life, have always aſſerted, that Applauſe in this warfare is much an harder Enemy to deal with, than Calumny. It is not my Reputation then (any farther than the preſervation of it is a Duty) which calls upon me at this time to take the Pen into my hand: But it is that which ſeems to be ſo united to it, as to ſuffer with it, I mean my Religion. For altho' perſonal defects (unleſs they come to be general) ought to caſt no blemiſh on any Profeſſion, yet how far ſhall we think that ſuch things will influence weak perſons, when a * *ſuppoſed* Crime of a *ſuppoſed* Jeſuit made ſo violent an Impreſſion on Dr. *Teniſon*, whilſt he was Young, againſt their whole Order, that

* Gubbard *whom D. T. (in his Ep. to his Pariſhioners) mentions to have ſucceeded his Father in his Benefice of* Mondelly, *and afterwards to have Preached Purgatory, &c: might*

might (for aught the Doctor pretends to know) during his stay in that place come first to be convinced of the truth of such points as he Preached, so that what the Doctor takes for Dissimulation *(which probably would not have discovered it self where there was a good Benefice to be had by it) might be Change. It being great pity, that every one should be as* Immutable *in Evil as D. T. This might be the case, were this* G— *might be a Church of* England-*man as others have observed.*

(maugre his entire Doctorship of Divinity) he is like to carry it with him to his Grave: And consequently to the Tribunal of that Judge, who, when he was our Master, taught us more Charitable Lessons? And to such a strange degree of partiality does this rash Judgment arrive, that with many Protestants one good Man is sufficient to bring their Religion into Repute, and one evil Christian enough to Discredit ours. Which, tho' unreasonable in them, is yet a good Argument to us; in the first place, that we should take the utmost care, not to afford any just ground for Aspersions; and in the next, that we should endeavor (as far as modesty gives leave) to relieve our selves from those, which are unjustly thrown upon us. Wherefore, tho' I am not ignorant how hard a thing it is for the plainest reason to break through the prejudices of prepossessed and embittered minds; yet because I hope there are still some impartial (at least not extravagantly partial) Men in the World, I will not decline this task, which I shall look on as sufficiently recompensed, if it shall help to bring any one Soul from under those mistakes which Dr. *Tenison's less sincere and less Generous* Artifices may have involved it in. *Ep.* to his Parishoners.

Dr. T. is not so ill a Painter, as not to know, that a few strokes of the Pencil, will quite change the Countenance of the Picture, nor (as we perceive by his Narrative) so disinterested, as not to

make use of this knowledge, when it is for his advantage.

However, that we may not make our Composition with him more difficult than is needful, there is one part of that Misrepresentation which I noted above, *viz.* the supposititious Ornaments of his own sayings, for which we shall not lay much to his charge; for, altho' his part of the Conference hath been lick'd since it's Birth into as much shape as it was capable of, yet after all this paternal industry it is but an homely Creature still, and neither doth us much harm, nor (I am verily perswaded) would it have appeared to the Doctor himself worthy of Publication, had it not been in vertue of that Instinct, whereby *The Crow thinks her own Young ones the whitest.*

Mr. *P.* was the chief (and indeed, the only person Originally concerned) in this Conference, and, as such, he hath given the World a just account of it. What relates to my self, is much shorter and of less moment, for tho' a vein of my Name runs through the Doctors whole Narrative, which makes people think, that I was a principal Combatant in this occasion; yet in truth, coming only as a witness, and under an obligation of silence, I Religiously observed it, unless it were, when the Doctor applied his Discourse to me: And then too I spoke no longer than the Doctor pleased, which was not half so long, as was necessary for the making out, or even proposing any one Argument. Which I could not take ill for two Reasons; First, *because I was not his proper Antagonist*; And Secondly, *because he used him that was so, after the same fashion.*

fashion. I say, I never meddled in the Controversie, but when the Doctor spoke to me, and it would have been *ill breeding* not to have answered him: Excepting only, at the latter end of the day, when the Disputants rose up, and there seemed to be a *Liberty of Conscience* for speaking; especially when the Doctor blurted out a Proposition, which all good Men, who should have reflected on it's consequences, ought to have taken notice of.

Besides, I was separated from them for a very considerable time: *viz.* (as I believe) during the greatest part of the Conference. For Mr. *P.* having intreated me not to meddle with the Disputation, and a Catholic Gentlewoman, or two observing, that Dr. *Tenison* when he had no desire to answer Mr. *P*'s. Questions, would turn abruptly towards me, and as soon as he had a mind to break off with me (which as I have said already, was very soon) he turned as abruptly back again to Mr. *P.* They advised me to withdraw; one of them telling me, that the Doctor by the opportunity he had of turning to and fro in that manner, not only evaded the prosecution of the Arguments, but had also a plausible pretence of boasting (as he did) that he had two to deal with. Whereupon I thanked them for their advice, and not greatly apprehending the loss, I was like to sustain by being absent from the Discourse, I retired into another corner of the Room; where (according to what I have said) I continued a great while, talking with several persons (all Strangers to me) and not knowing what passed between the Disputants; for tho soon after my going off, Dr. *Tenison* (having some occasion, as I suppose, for diverting the Discourse) called

for

for me back; yet I excused my self, telling him, that he had excepted against my Company at first, and that therefore I might venture on so much ill breeding, as to refuse it to him now, or to that purpose: Neither did I return to him, till his clamor and his parties importunity even forced me to it, which (as I take it) was not very long before the Conference broke up. And then too as soon as the Doctor shook me off by turning again to Mr. *P.* I retired as before.

I mention this, that my Readers may have a true notion of that part which I bore in this Conference, and not be misguided by the Doctors Relation, which scarce allows me any interval of absence, and seems to make me privy to Discourses, which I knew nothing of, and therefore can say nothing to. And whosoever considers what I have here related of my own concern in this Dispute, and how little even Dr. *T.* himself says of any body else, excepting only Mr. *P.* will not judge that the Doctor, tho' he speaks of nine Priests or Priests fellows, was overmatch'd by number.

Moreover had Mr. *P.* stood in need of the Doctors Craft, and applied himself to the slanders by he might have had the Credit and Convenience of (at least) Twenty Antagonists. And even without his seeking he had two or three besides the Minister. Particularly the Schoolmaster, whom I look upon as next to a Minister, with as much Reason (I presume) as the Doctor look'd on me as next to a Priest. Besides, for the Doctors farther encouragement, the Cry was on his side: *To hear him speak, not to interrupt him* (that is, to suffer him to interrupt us) and the like, which are of no small

small advantage in such engagements, where to speak most, is to argue best.

But not to detain my Readers any longer from a more particular and methodical account (as far as so much confusion will allow of method) of what concerned me in this wonderful business, I must acquaint them, that on *Michaelmas* day last, having been at the *Savoy* Chappel, to comply with the Obligations of that Festival; at my going thence, I met with Mr. *P.* who told me, *That at three of the Clock in the afternoon he was to have a Conference with Dr.* Tenison; *That it had been occasioned by an Apprentice, who had come to him, to be instructed in the Catholic Religion, and thereby extreamly displeased his Friends, and particularly his Master. That it was thought convenient, he should not go alone, but take some person with him who might observe what passed, and hinder, as much as might be, the bad effects of such Misrepresentations, as experience shews us, are hardly avoidable on these occasions. That he desired, that I would be the person, who accompanied him. Lastly, That it would not be my Province to speak any thing, but only* (as he had said) *to take notice of what passed.*

I must confess, my willingness to be engaged in this affair was not extraordinary. It had not been very long, since I had drawn a sufficient trouble on my self by hearkening to such another Invitation, and had learnt at the expence of losing that Privacy which I would have preferr'd, how unsafe it is to share (tho' never so inconsiderably,) in a *Difference* with Men, who possibly may have better Wits than Consciences, and care not how they wound the latter, so they may secure the Reputation of the former. However, considering that

that we were not born for our selves, and that our reward hereafter, will be proportionable to our labors here; I resolved to comply with Mr. P's. desire, and leave the event to Providence, which disposes all things for the best, and will not suffer us
* 1 Cor. c. 10. v. 13. to be* tryed beyond that which we are able to bear. Wherefore I told Mr. P. *that I was to Dine at an House in* Spring-Garden, *near* Charing-Cross, *and that if he pleased to call on me there, at two of the Clock, I would wait on him to the place appointed for the Conference*, which (as he had told me) was in *Long-Acre*.

Mr. P. came to me at the prefixt hour, having no body in his Company, as several worthy persons can witness, and I (likewise alone) immediately departed with him.

Whilst we were on our way, Mr. P. told me, *that he intended to propose a* Rule of Faith *for the Subject of the Conference*: Which I very much approved, as being that, whereon (according to my judgment) the whole business of Controversie depends; for, since all sides agree, that there are some things necessary to be Believed in order to Salvation, and hence it is rationally inferred, that Almighty God must have left some means of coming to the knowledge of such *necessary* things: Which *means* we call the *Rule of Faith*; It follows, that when we have the Rule of Faith, we have the means of knowing what we are bound to believe, and what not; which is the end of all Controversie.

And therefore I wonder, that Dr. T. should so often
* Pag. 13. 17, 21. &c. say, * *that he desired to fix Mr.* P. *to something in his Disputation, that he could keep him to nothing*, and the like. As if he had proposed nothing for the matter

matter of their Debate, when he propoſed *a Rule of Faith*; whereas it is the main, or indeed the only thing which ought to be well ſettled. For particular Articles of Faith may be True according to one Rule, and Falſe according to another, and therefore unleſs we know what Rule is true, we ſhall not be able to diſtinguiſh what Articles are true. As for inſtance, the Quakers Article of the *unlawfulneſs of all manner of Swearing* is true according to the Rule of * *Scripture interpreted by themſelves*, but falſe according to the Rule of *Scripture interpreted by the Tradition of the Church*, and there will be no means of telling the Quakers, which Doctrin they ought to believe, unleſs you can tell them, which of the two Rules they ought to follow.

* *Swear not, neither by Heaven, neither by Earth, neither by any other Oath, &c. St.* James *c.* 5. *v.* 12.

I hope, the Reader will pardon this Digreſſion, for the great importance of the matter, and when he hath well conſidered it, will not be of Dr. *T*'s. mind, and think the adjuſting, or aſcertaining a Rule of Faith, to be ſo trivial a thing, nay, to be nothing, as the Doctor makes it. But becauſe I believe, that I ſhall have occaſion of ſaying more on this ſubject hereafter, I will ſay no more at preſent.

Mr. *P.* having (as I ſaid) acquainted me with the Queſtion he had choſen out for the ſubject of the Conference, I told him, *That having had ſome experience of ſuch meetings, I foreſaw that all would end in confuſion, unleſs what was ſpoken on both ſides by way of Argument, were immediately Written down.* And therefore I adviſed him to propoſe as ſoon as we met, *that it might be ſo.*

Being come to *Long-Acre*, we went into an

 Houſe,

Houſe, which was not far from that where the Conference was to be, and ſtayed there till news was brought us, that Dr. *T.* was come.

During our ſtay in this Houſe, there came in a Gentleman to us, whom I had never ſeen before: Nor (as I underſtood afterwards) was he ſo much as known by name to Mr. *P.* He looked, as if his Curioſity, or ſome better Motive led him, to know what ſhould happen at the Conference. We were told alſo, *that it had been noiſed abroad, and that there would be many Proteſtants at it.* For my part I thought, that the more perſons were preſent, the more good would probably be done, in caſe the Conference were fairly carried on, and eſpecially by *Writing*. I had never heard that it was agreed on, that the Meeting ſhould be private, nor cared that it ſhould be ſo. For, *Veritas non quærit Angulos*, and the Catholic Faith was never yet afraid of Appearing, but always of being Hidden, that is, by Lies, Slanders and other Miſrepreſentations kept from the Peoples knowledge.

Word being brought, *that the Doctor was come*, we (*viz.* Mr. *P.* and my ſelf) went immediately to him. Who followed us, I neither knew, nor troubled my ſelf to obſerve; having always underſtood, that there were but two concerned, Mr. *Pulton* as the Controvertiſt, and my ſelf only as a witneſs: And that the reſt (whether Proteſtants or Catholics) came only as Hearers.

As ſoon as we entred into the Room, where Dr. *T.* was, the Doctor Greeted us with a Cavil, ſaying ſomewhat to this purpoſe: *Look you here, I am come without ſo much as a Friend or Servant: This* (*viz.* The coming in of ſo much Company) *is not accord-*

according to our agreement. M. P. replyed to this effect, *That he had only brought one Gentleman with him,* viz. *Me: That I was not to speak at all in the Controversie, but only came as a witness of what passed: That he thought this caution reasonable in regard of the many Misrepresentations, which had been but too frequent of late in things of this Nature.* Hereupon the Doctor addressed himself to me, and asked me (in a Tone more imperious than I have usually met with) *whether I was a Priest or not*: Saying, that *now* (to his grief, I suppose) *I need not be affraid to own it.* I answered him, (tho' I * *thought it a condescention to an impertinence*) that *I was not.* He continued, that *he would know who I was*: And I was so much in the *Condescending* humor, that I told him my Name was *Meredith.* At which words the Doctor seemed to start, crying out immediately, *that he excepted against me*: * *That I had given out a* * *false Copy of the Conference between Dr.* St--. *and Mr.* G--. *and that he had received this Copy from his friend Captain* O. It was not without some surprise, (as those who are better acquainted with me will imagin) that I heard these things. However (as the Doctor is pleased to say) I *calmly* replyed. *That I had been present at the Conference, he spake of. That one had Written there for Dr.* St--. *and another for Mr.* G--. *That Mr.* G--. *had caused some Copies to be made of that which his Writer took. That he had delivered one of those Copies to me. And that it was this Copy which I lent to Captain* O. *That I did not apprehend there was any difference between this Copy and* Dr. St--s. *That therefore, had there been any fault in the case, it had not been mine.* For further particulars I referr'd the Company (as I

* Pag. 15.

* Dr. T's. 1st. *Objection against me.*

* *Had Dr.* T. *heard both sides? No, but if Dr.* St--s. *Authority be not sufficient to make a thing be credited without farther Examination, what will become of Dr.* T's.

 do

* A Letter to Dr. *E. S.*, &c.

do now my Readers) to what I had * Publiſhed in this matter. In which the whole matter of Fact is repreſented with ſo much fairneſs, that notwithſtanding what a ſubtile and concern'd Adverſary has been able to alledge againſt it, I queſtion not, but it ſtill remains moſt ſatisfactory with all thoſe, whoſe prejudices ſtand not more in need of Grace for their removal, than Arguments. And for this reaſon, being informed, that the Controverſial part of this affair was undertaken by better hands (a task in which, there is nothing laborious ſave only the great copiouſneſs of that which eaſily offers it ſelf to be ſpoken againſt Dr. *St---s* Argumentations) I could not but think, that to meddle any farther with the bare matter of fact, would ſavor more of a fond, or ambitious deſire of having the laſt word, than of any thing elſe: Eſpecially when other more uſeful and neceſſary employments required as much attendance from me at that time as my health could ſpare. And therefore to thoſe Proteſtants, who have ſpoken to me of this buſineſs, I have ſcarce ſaid any thing more, than *that I deſired them to compare both Accounts*, viz. *Dr.* St---s *and mine, and then judge.*

I think there was one thing new, whereof Mr. G---. was accuſed, in Dr. *St*---s ſecond Letter, viz. *That over the ſecond Diſputation in ſome of Mr. G---s Copies, was written this inſcription*, Stillingfleets Firſt Queſtion. *Whereas* (ſays the Doctor) *the firſt Queſtion of that Diſputation was put by Mr.* T---. He looks on this as a wilful miſtake, and that it was deſigned to make the World believe, that the Doctor broke

broke * off the first Disputation. Now, I dare say, that this never came into Mr. G---s head, nor would come into any ones else, who was not at a very great loss for Objections, and had not Authority enough to make a trifle pass for one.

* How accessory the Dr. was to the breaking off of the first Disputation is shewn in the Letter to Dr. *E. S. &c.*

The meaning of that Inscription was, that as in the first Disputation, Mr. G--- was the Proponent and Dr. *St--.* the Respondent, so in this last Dr. *St---.* was the Proponent: For tho' Mr. *T.* put this first Question, yet Dr. *St---.* abetted it, and was still look'd on as the only person engaged in the Dispute, and as such he put all the rest of the Questions. And this is the Explanation of this Mysterious Inscription. In which, I think, there was nothing to be blamed, save only the omission of the Doctors Title.

It doth not occur to me at present whether, or no, there were any other new accusation in the forementioned Letter. But whatever there was, I am sure, it was of no other complexion than this.

I have ventured on this Digression, not only to save my self the trouble of a Book, but also that my Readers may know, what petty and wretched debates a Man must be engaged in, who is to give an account of Modern Conferences, and consequently how much Compassion the employment deserves. But as miserable as it is, I must now return to it.

During my abovementioned Reply to Dr. *Tenisons* Objection, and after it, the Doctor still grumbled; but to give him his due, his interruptions were always so thick whilst I spoke, that I was not then assured, whether he attended to what I said, or not.

Mr.

Mr. *P.* ſeeing Dr. *T.* diſſatisfied with my Company, was unwilling, that the time ſhould be conſumed in wrangling, which was deſigned for Diſputation, and therefore offered the Doctor, that I ſhould withdraw and another Gentleman, who accidentally came in after us remain as a witneſs. Which, for my own part, I ſhould have agreed to without any great reſentment; for (I muſt confeſs) the ſmall taſt I had of the Doctors Converſation, made me not over fond of his farther acquaintance. But I did not find that the Doctor was mightily ſatisfied with this propoſal, who ſeemed to look after Exceptions more than Accommodations, and was in no great haſt to begin the diſpute; and therefore I made another to him, which yet had the ill fortune to pleaſe him leſs. I told the Doctor, *That he need not trouble himſelf, what witneſſes were preſent, That he ſhould appoint his own Writer, who ſhould Pen down what was ſaid by way of Argument on both ſides, and that this ſhould be looked on as the only Authentic account of what paſſed. This*, I ſaid, *would free the Doctor from all danger of being Miſrepreſented:* And in this propoſal Mr. *P.* joyned with me and was very earneſt for it. The Doctor anſwered, *that he had no Pen and Ink nor Writer* [things hard to be come by in *London*] And then, all his Objections againſt me vaniſhing on the ſuddain, and inſiſting no longer on the clearing of the Room, he deſired Mr. *P.* and my ſelf to ſit down by him, ſaying, *that he would Diſcourſe on ſome Preliminaries*, which I could make no other conſtruction of, than that Dr. *Teniſon* had much rather have to do with a witneſs, whoſe Credit he had taken care to leſſen, than with a

Record

Record, the Teſtimony whereof had been undoubted.

It will be proper here to make ſome ſhort remarks on the Doctors Relation. He ſays, *pag.* 4. that *he eſpied Mr.* Meredith *in the Room, whom he look'd upon as next to a Prieſt.* One would conclude by this expreſſion, that Dr. *T.* had known me, whereas by his queſtioning *who I was, &c.* he ſeemed not to know me: But whether he diſſembled or not, I will not determin. He ſays, *p.* 4. *that* Mr. *P. was content to diſmiſs all beſides a witneſs for himſelf, and Mr.* Meredith *was propoſed.* This again looks, as if Mr. *P.* had brought ſeveral in his Company, and that having choſen me out of them for a witneſs, he was perſuaded to dimiſs the reſt; whereas on Dr. *T*——*s* firſt complaint, Mr. *P.* declared, *that he had only brought me with him; That I came meerly to obſerve what paſſed in the Conference, and was not to diſpute in it. That if the Doctor did not approve of me, he would take another: Or, if the Doctor ſo pleaſed, he was content, that all ſhould retire, excepting only the Doctor himſelf, together with the Boy, for whoſe ſake (as Mr. P. had always underſtood) the Conference was held.* How much of this is in the Doctors *True Account?* And yet the Doctor (if you will believe him *pa.* 43.) is too blunt a Man, to be a Man of Artifice.

After this he ſays: *Againſt Mr.* Meredith, Dr. T. *made three Objections*: And again, *pa.* 5. *After theſe exceptions taken at Mr.* M. *as a witneſs, Dr.* T. *perceiving it next to impoſſible to clear the Room,* &c. *called Mr.* Meredith *to him.* Whereas he called me to him on mine and Mr. *P*——*s* propoſing to have the

the Controverſie taken in writing, and he had then made but one of his Objections againſt me. And then for the *Impoſſibility of clearing the Room*, the Doctor never put it to the Tryal; nor came to any agreement with Mr. *P.* about it: I am ſure, that the Room might very eaſily have been cleared of my Company, and therefore I wonder, how the Doctor after ſuch ſolid *exceptions taken at* Mr. *M. as a witneſs*, came to *call Mr.* Meredith *to him, and place himſelf between Mr.* P. *and Mr.* Meredith.

One would think, that Dr. *Teniſon* were framing a piece of Dramatic Poetry, and that he thought it allowable for him to vary from the true Hiſtory, as often as it was for the advantage of his work, which (as the Reader will perceive by what he finds here) is very often. Indeed the Doctors Narrative is like the wrong ſide of the Hangings, where there is nothing right, or in its due proportion, but a confuſed Reſemblance of what it ſhould be. And this is ſufficient to deceive thoſe, who are (either by intereſt or humor) very willing to be deceived.

The Doctor then ſitting down, and cauſing us (Mr. *P.* and my ſelf) to place our ſelves by him, ſaid (as I have already told you) that *he would treat of ſome Preliminaries.* But the Coaſt being now clear, and in appearance the danger of having the Arguments Penn'd down, quite over, Dr. *Teniſon* (perhaps for my having been ſo unfortunate as to propoſe Writing) was reſolved to have another bout with me. He told me, *that he had other Objections againſt me, and* * *one was, that I had been already*

* *Dr.* T's 2d. *Objection againſt me.*

already Diſpoſing of his Pariſh, and had canton'd it out for Fryers. This Objection I muſt confeſs was a moſt ſenſible one; but it was not more touching to the Doctor, than it was aſtoniſhing to me, ſince I could not remember, that I had ever had the leaſt thought of any ſuch thing. But the Dr. adding, *That I had ſaid, his Benefice would maintain Thirty Fryers, and that his friend Captain O. had given him the Information*; I diſcovered whence this grand Objection had it's riſe, or rather it's pretence. I called to mind, that in ſome diſcourſes concerning the great want of Charity and Religious Zeal, which had come into the World together with the Reformation, or (if you pleaſe) uſher'd it in; amongſt other things I ſaid, *that this appeared not only in the diſcontinuance of* Miſſions *abroad for the Converſion of Infidels, but likewiſe in the ſcarcity of Pious and Charitable* works *at home.* I inſtanced particularly, *that whilſt Men were buſie in Building* private Houſes, *they took no care for* Churches: *And that hence it came to paſs, that the Pariſhes in the Suburbs were unreaſonably large; and that it muſt needs be impoſſible for the Curates and thoſe few Readers their Aſſiſtants to comply with the Duties belonging to their Employments, in ſuch manner as they ought.* I obſerved, *that in the Pariſhes within the Walls (which were Eſtabliſhed before the Reformation) there ſeldom died above one or two a week in each Pariſh, and in ſome of the out-Pariſhes there died (for the moſt part) forty or fifty: So that, according to the Proportion appointed by our Anceſtors, we ought to have thirty, or forty Pariſhes and Pariſh-Churches inſtead of one.* I ſaid farther, *that where forty or fifty died in a week, there were probably ten, or*

twenty times as many sick, and in danger of death: Who would all stand in need of their Pastors help. And how could it be possible for one Man (or indeed any ten Men) to visit a thousand persons every week, (which amounted to more than a hundred and forty a day, one day with another) staying with them so much time, as was necessary for the giving them the Communion and doing all those other things which are appointed to be done by the Common-Prayer-Book *in the* Visitation of the Sick, *as also for the Instructing, Exhorting, and Comforting them, as occasion shall be seen?* I said, *how could it be possible for so small a number of Men to do all this, and yet at the same time comply with all their other Parochial Functions; such as were,* Reading Common-Prayer *Daily,* Preaching *once or twice a Week,* Marrying, Burying, Christening, Catechizing, Reconciling Enmities, Resolving Doubts, *with many other things of this kind, which are incumbent on Curates, and whereof there is scarce any one Branch, which in these large Parishes is not enough, if not too much, for one Man.*

[Wherefore for the future, Dr. *T.* needs not take so much pains to convince the World, that he is able to Dispute against Nine Jesuits at once, since those who can believe that he performs what of necessity must be incumbent on him in two such populous Parishes, as he possesses, will easily be perswaded, that he is able to make his party good against forty of those Fathers. Nay, he may well be equal to Nine Priests, who has the Employment of above an Hundred.]

I said likewise, *That I had heard, there were Thirty Thousand Communicants belonging to St.* Martins *Parish,*

Parish, if not more; that if these should have a mind to Assemble together for the receiving the Sacrament, or hearing a Sermon, it would not be possible for them to do it. The Church (as I supposed) not being able to contain one quarter of that number; and that the English Clergy *ought not to wonder, that there were so many* Dissenters, *since their Parishioners were forced to go to Meeting-houses for Elbow-room, or even for any opportunity of doing something like the* serving of God. And for this reason They ought not to have manifested so much Zeal for the Suppression of Conventicles, till the fervor of their exhortations had inspir'd More into their hearers for the Building of Churches.

To this I added, *That over and above, that in Catholic Countries the* Parish Priests *were more numerous, and held a better proportion with their Flocks, than amongst us, there were great numbers of* Regulars, *or* Religious *Men, who were no small assistance to the* Secular Clergy *in* saying Mass, Preaching, Catechizing, Hearing Confessions *and the like. But, that this* (I meant, *such a plentiful provision of Spiritual Guides*) *was not so practicable in* England, *in regard that most of the* English Curates *had Families to provide for, and consequently stood in need of greater Benefices, than those who had obliged themselves to a single Life: and for the same reason, what was sufficient for many Parsons beyond Sea, would scarce be enough for one here. Especially,* I said, *the* Regulars *were maintained for very little, and that* 600 *l. per annum (which I heard the Parsonage of St.* Martins *was worth, tho perhaps it may be more) would keep Thirty of them, at least with the convenience of an House to dwell in. Hinc illæ Lachrymæ! Now,*

such Discourses as these, I do confess, that I have made more than once; and particularly I remember, that I spake somewhat of this kind to C. O. and I am so far from being ashamed of it, that I cannot but think that the cause of shame lies at their door, who are more concerned for the extent of their Jurisdiction or Profit, than for the benefit of the Souls committed to their care: And when I understand that Dr. *Tenison* is one of those, it is then, that I shall begin to do, what he said I had done, *viz. pity the State of St.* Martins.

It was according to what I have said here, that I answered the Doctor telling him withal, *that I had spoken of the largeness of the* Out-Parishes *in general, and not of* his *in particular:* And this (as one would have thought) would have satisfied any reasonable Man. But the French say, *A scalded Cat dreads cold Water*, and it seems the Doctor (which I then knew nothing of) had so deep an * *Impression made on him in his Youth* by the loss of his Fathers Benefice, that now the least hint, which so much as brings it to his mind, *raises his Suspicion and Indignation* to an high degree.

* See the Drs. Epistle to his Parishioners.

Moreover, the Doctor seemed to take it ill, that I undervalued the *Reformed Charity*, and said, *that there were too many Churches within the Walls*, and *that in some places there were two in one Church-Yard.* He talked somewhat likewise, of *an Act of Parliament for Building of Twelve new Churches for the Suburbs*, which was no small confirmation of what I had said of the want of them. I looked on that compulsive way of doing good Works as not so * clear a Demonstration of Charity, as when they are done voluntarily and without constraint, and therefore

* certainly the Statute of Mortmain was a better sign of the Charity of former Ages, than this Act for building Churches is of that of the present.

therefore I told the Doctor, *that it argued ſome defect in* theirs, *that it ſtood in need of* Acts of Parliament, *for doing things, which were, in a manner, abſolutely neceſſary.*

The Doctor anſwered, that *he wiſh'd, he could ſee ſome of our Charity*, or ſome ſuch like words. What he meant by this wiſh, I could not well tell, *viz.* whether he would have us employ our preſent Liberty in Building Churches, that, when time ſerved, they might diſpoſſeſs us of them, as they did of our Antient ones, and ſo be Provided without burthening the People by Act of Parliament, or ſomething elſe? In this doubt I asked him only, *whether he would have us Build Churches now in* England? To which he made me no anſwer, but ſeemed to attempt ſomething for the proof of Proteſtant Charity. But all, that I can remember he ſaid, was, that *he would not brag of himſelf*: Which I eſteemed a Rhetorical way of doing it. And certainly he muſt needs be put hard to it for an inſtance of *Charity*, who is forced ſo far to intrench upon *Humility* for it, as to begin with himſelf.

I am not ignorant, (all this while) that ſome Hoſpitals, Alms-houſes and Churches have been Built by Proteſtants: But there is more proportion between Dr. *Teniſons* two Pariſhes and a couple of the pooreſt Vicaridges in *Wales*, than there is between the Monuments of Catholic Zeal, * and whatever of that kind hath been done by Proteſtants. It will be a great while before the Reformation builds the fortieth part of what it hath pulled down. Nay, (ſuppoſing that this poor Nation is not to return to it's Antient Religion) there

* *For ſome proof of what is here ſaid, ſee a Book lately Printed at* Oxford, *called* Pietas Romana & Pariſienſis, *By which in ſome meaſure the reſt may be gueſſed.*

there is more likely-hood, that Reformations following one another, like Egyptian Plagues, the ſucceeding ones ſhould ſtill devour what the preceding leave, than that Men who have taken Sacrilege for the Service of God, ſhould endeavor to repair any part of that which is already Deſtroyed.

The Doctor having finiſhed his Second Objection, put an end to my defence, by bringing on his Third, without telling me, whether he thought, that what I ſaid was true, or if it were, whether he judged it ſatisfactory, or not. But every Man minds his own buſineſs: And it was not the Doctor's to Abſolve, but to Accuſe. *There is yet* (ſaid the Doctor) *another* * *Objection againſt you, which is, that you are One, who have forſaken our Church.*

* *Dr. T's. 3d. Objection againſt me.*

That which then immediately occurred to me for an Anſwer, was the parallel of what I had often heard from Proteſtants, concerning ſuch as turn to them, *viz. That I was then the better judge, having known the Doctrine of both Churches.* But I had forgotten, that what is * reaſon in a Proteſtants mouth, is ſtark naught in a Catholics. The Doctor replyed, *That I went away Young from their Church, and that if I had underſtood it better, I ſhould not have left it.*

* *When Church of* Englandmen *diſpute with Diſſenters, Church Authority is of great force, and no Scripture is of private interpretation: ——But when Catholics argue with them, the caſe is alter'd, and every Man muſt be his own Judge.*

I know not what the Doctor accounts *Young*: But it was not, till I had gone through one of the beſt and moſt careful * Schools in *England*, and ſpent above three years at the Univerſity, and as many in *Spain*. And I queſtion not, but the Doctors of the

* *Weſtminſter-School.*

the Church of *England* will allow, that after all this I must needs have been come to the Age of *judging for my self*, since I find that for this Liberty in others they do not require so much Education, as mine amounted to. And had it been so, that I had embraced the Roman Catholic Religion without sufficient consideration, the last fifteen, or sixteen years, which I have lived in it, had been time enough for the Correction of an Error, which my Intereſt, and Neceſſities would have prompted me to have laid aſide. But (I thank God) I have not been the leaſt ſhaken in my Faith ever ſince my Converſion, either by what I have ſeen written, or heard ſpoken by the moſt Learned Proteſtants. But on the contrary I have been ſo far from repenting, that I turned ſo Young, that the more I read or diſcourſed of theſe matters, the more I diſcerned the Excellence of the Catholic Religion on the one hand, and the blindneſs of ſo many of my fellow Creatures on the other, and conſequently I had no other cauſes for grief, than firſt, that my Converſion was no ſooner, and next, that I had not yet been grateful enough, that it was ſo ſoon.

The Doctor ſays, that * no Man, who well underſtands their Church, departs from it, upon true Principles. And I am much miſtaken, if there be not very many, who know well enough what the Church of *England* Teaches, and yet depart from her, on no other principles than thoſe which they learnt from her ſelf, *viz. That the Church is to be followed no farther than ſhe agrees with Scripture*, and every particular Man is left to judge how far ſhe agrees with it. * Pag. 5.

It

It would be tedious and unneceſſary to ſet down here all thoſe Principles or Motives, upon which I departed from the Church of *England*, ſince I cannot ſo much pretend to extraordinary things as to deny, but that they are the ſame, which have led others from her both before and ſince, and may be ſeen at large in many Books. However, (if my Readers will give me leave) I will lay before them ſome of thoſe Points which began my doubts, and prevail'd more particularly with me.

**Some Motives of my Converſion to the Catholic Faith.*

*Firſt, I had been taught, that the Church of Chriſt continued pure for the firſt Five Hundred Years after it's Inſtitution, and that from thence downwards ſeveral groſs Errors and Corruptions had crept into it, and that it had been infected with theſe Plagues for about a Thouſand Years: And that then Almighty God out of his Infinite Commiſeration enlightned *Martin Luther*, *Zuinglius*, and other (as I thought) Pious Men ſo far, as that they clearly diſcern'd theſe Corruptions, Preach'd againſt them, and by that means reſcued a great number of Chriſtians from that darkneſs, which the *Gates of Hell* (contrary to our Lords promiſe) or ſome unaccountable Fatality had engaged them in. And Laſtly, that I my ſelf had been ſo happy as to be one of this number.

This was that Idea of Chriſtianity, which I then had: For as to what they talk'd of a conſtant Succeſſion of Proteſtants from the fifth Age down to our times, I had never heard it from any Wiſe Man, nor indeed can ſuch an Impoſture find place with any one, who is ſo much an Hiſtorian, as the common Diſcourſe will make him. Every body knows, that the firſt Reformers, when they left

the

the Roman Church, joyned with no other Society or Sect of Christians then in the World either in Communion or Doctrin, which must have been done, had this pretended Succession continued. Their pretence was at that time to Reform the whole Church, and not to seek out any True one, which then had a Being, and stood in no need of Reformation. Nay, they were so far from thinking it necessary to joyn with any former Church in order to the preserving a Succession, that they did not unite with one another: But parted their stock, and each Adventurer set up for himself.

This then was the most Rational Account, that I could give of my Faith, *viz.* That our Church finding, that all Christian Churches had been in Error for a Thousand Years, forsook that Error, and reformed it self according to the pattern of the first Five Hundred Years after Christ. For to be of a Christian Church, which never had any being from Christs time till this present, I thought a most unreasonable thing.

Now, none can write after a Copy without having that Copy which they pretend to Write by. I mean, it was impossible for the Church of *England* to Reform it self according to the first Five Hundred Years of Christianity, without knowing what those Christians Taught and Practis'd. And how could this possibly be done, but by the Holy Fathers and other Writers of those times? Wherefore I firmly believed (as I am perswaded many Thousands do) that these Writers were meer strangers to all those Doctrins which we had forsaken, and consequently, that no mention was made amongst them of *Purgatory*, *Prayer for the Dead*,

 Invo-

Invocation of Saints, Veneration of Holy Images and Relics, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Reality of Christs Flesh in the Eucharist, the Decisive Authority of the Church in Controversial matters, the Spiritual Supremacy of St. Peter *and his Successors*, with some other things of this nature; I say, I took it for granted, that nothing of all this was to be found in those Primitive Records of the Christian Religion. But when I looked into them I found it quite otherwise, and that those things, which hitherto I had accounted Novelties, were as clearly set down in these Writings as any other Points of Christian Doctrin. For instances, to avoid length, I will refer my Readers to a Book not long since Published, Entituled, *Nubes Testium*, which hath Collections out of some of those Books which then fell into my hands, and must weigh with Men of any tolerable moderation, notwithstanding that which is, or can be said against it.

Now, what was there for me to be done in this condition? I had taken it on trust, that I was a Member of a Church which had Copied out the first Five Hundred Years; but found my Error.

It was not unknown to me, that several Quotations out of the Fathers were produced in the behalf of Protestant Opinions: But to me they all seemed wrested, or, at least, capable of interpretations, which were not repugnant to what the same Fathers more plainly and fully speak in other places for a contrary Doctrin. In a word, what appeared to me in favor of the Catholic Cause was clear, full, and incapable of any other meaning. But that which offered it self in opposition to it was obscure, short and interpretable in another sense; and

and indeed, for the most part, evidently requiring another, when joyned to it's antecedents and consequents.

Others said, *That the Fathers were Men and had Errors, and that they contradicted one another, and themselves to boot.* But this Plea was as little to my satisfaction as the former: For this serves only to weaken the Authority of the Fathers, and if good, evinces nothing, but that They are not to be relyed on. And then, how can the Church of *England* make out, that she follows the first Five Hundred Years, when she hath no other means of knowing what was believed in those times, but by such Authors as are not to be trusted?

For what some People say, of our being able to know by Scripture what was the Belief and Practice of these Primitive Christians, is wholly absurd: For we know not from Scripture (at least, according to the Principles of the Church of *England*) whether the Christians of the first Five Hundred Years, lived according to the Scripture, or not. The Scripture does not tell us of a Church, which is to continue only to the end of the Fifth Age. It tells us, indeed, of one *which is to continue to the End of the World*: And this Church (I hope) may be found as well in the Fourteenth Age, as in the Fifth. For if all the Christians of the Fourteenth were Erroneous and Corrupted, and stood in need of Reformation, those of the Fifth might have been so too, for any thing which the Scriptures can assure us to the contrary.

This Rock then of my Protestant Faith being shaken, I mean, a Belief, that the Church of *England* had Model'd it self according to the Doctrins

of the first Five Hundred Years, it will not be wonder'd at, if (at least) I gave way to some doubts.

I found no better footing in that way, which was taken by those Church of *England*-men, who conversed more with Roman Catholics than with Protestant Dissenters, *viz. Scripture, as it is understood by every private Man.*

First, Because those who took that way differed from one another in most material things, and also, Such as were esteemed Heretics by the Church of *England*, followed the same Rule.

Secondly, Because according to my own Judgment (who were by this Rule to judge for my self) the Church of *England* was beholding to Tradition for some Parts of her Doctrin and Practice, as *Infant-Baptism, the Observation of the first Day of the Week*, and the like, having no clear Scripture for them, and therefore could not hold them, and require them to be held, by the Rule of Scripture Interpreted without the help of Tradition.

Thirdly, Because it was sincerely my own Judgment, that the Scripture was much clearer for the Catholics than for the Protestants, particularly in *Transubstantiation, Sacramental Confession, Extreme Unction, Purgatory, St.* Peters *Supremacy*, and lastly and chiefly (being that which includes all other Points) the *Decisive Authority of the Church*; wherefore if I must follow Scripture Interpreted by my self, I must at the same time necessarily cease to follow the Church of *England*.

These certainly were Motives, if not for an absolute departure from the Church of *England*, yet still, at least (as I have already hinted) for the doubting of her Truth.

About

About this time I remember, that I had two notions concerning Faith.

First, That Faith was not that which must necessarily suit with the Fancies of particular Men, (since then it ought to be as various as those Fancies were) but it was that, which God would have us believe, whether we fancied it or not, *viz.* That, which he would have us * submit our Fancies and Judgments to, meerly because it was revealed by him. And in this submission (as I thought) consisted both the Difficulty and Merit of Faith. And consequently, that I ought not so much to consider the nature of the things proposed to be believed, as the Authority by which they were proposed.

* *Bringing into Captivity all understanding into the Obedience of Christ*, 2 Cor. c. 10. v. 5.

Secondly, That this Faith was the * Gift of God, and for that reason, that more confidence was to be put in humbe Prayer for the obtaining it, than in any Human Skill or Industry. Wherefore (as far as God Almighties Grace assisted my weakness) I endeavored to obtain this Gift by that means, making it my earnest Prayer to his Divine Goodness, that I might know the Truth, and firmly purposing to embrace that which I should be convinced of, tho' it should be ever so contrary to my Worldly Interest, as the Roman Catholic Religion at that time most apparently was.

* Ephes. c. 2. v. 8.

To Prayer I judged it necessary to add a serious endeavor of amending my Life, lest otherwise I should be found to sue Hypocritically for more light from Almighty God, whilst I made no use of that which I had received from him by complying with what I already knew to be his Will. This is a Point, which all those, who are in search of the True Faith, ought to examin their Consciences upon

upon, and therefore I would not omit the mention of it in this place.

Amidst these doubts I confess ingenuously, that what our English Doctors have made so light of, was of great moment with me, *viz. That the Church of* England *men affirmed, that Salvation might be had amongst the Roman Catholics; but the Roman Catholics absolutely denyed, that the like was to be had amongst them.* For Salvation in the Roman Communion both Churches concurr'd; whereas for the latter, we had only the bare word of Protestants in their own behalf; Who likewise at the same time told us, they were fallible, and consequently, for ought they knew, might be mistaken. And if they were actually *mistaken*, I should be undone by tarrying with them; whereas on the other side, if they were *not mistaken*, I could receive no damage by being amongst the Roman Catholics. In a word, I considered, that if the Protestants were true, I should be safe with the Roman Catholics; but, if the Roman Catholics were right, I could not be so with the Protestants.

This Motive is so strong in it's own Nature, that many Protestants confess, that it must needs have great Power with those, who (as they say) cannot throughly examin the differences betwixt us; and these I take to be the greatest part of Mankind. And if so, I will venture to add, that GOD Almighty having taken as much care of the Ignorant, as of the Learned, would never permit Falshood to be supported by such Arguments, as must in common Prudence oblige all unlearned persons to be engaged in it.

But

But above all methinks, this Argument should be of force with those *Universal* Gentlemen, who pretend, that their Religion is the Catholic, because they believe nothing, but that wherein all agree, forgetting, that such a Restraint of their Belief is *peculiar* to themselves, and not *common*; whereas here is an Agreement of all Parties (at least, such as have any Esteem with them) on which they may safely rely, *viz.* That *Salvation* may be had in the Roman Catholic Church, which is all, we do, or at least ought to aim at by our Religion. As for those other Points, which perhaps they hold, *viz. A Deity, a Saviour*, and the like, tho' they have the universal consent of all Christians for their Truth; yet they have it not for their sufficiency to Salvation (especially so as to exclude the Necessity of believing other Articles, when they are duly proposed) and it will be of small Consequence to them, that what they hold common with others, proves True, if their additional Article, which holds *this Truth to be sufficient*, should prove False.

What was urged in derogation of this Argument, as if the Protestants shew'd a greater Charity by thinking well of Catholics, than Catholics did by thinking ill of them, was nothing to my purpose: For I was then in search of True Faith, and not of Charity, and knew withal, that how great appearance soever there might be of Charity, it could not be Real, unless it were grounded on * Orthodox Faith.

It seemed to me to be a surer mark of Charity for Men to adventure both Estate and Life, for the Conversion of others, as formerly the Apostles and

* *Without Faith it is impossible to please God*, Heb. c. 11. v. 6.

and now the Catholic Miſſioners did, than to keep at home, and in our warm Beds, and cry, *We hope* (or we declare) *they may be ſaved, tho' they are in an Error.* Which, if it were a Charity, was in my opinion a very Lazy one.

Moreover, if the Proteſtant Religion were falſe, it was more Charitable in the Catholics to tell them ſo, than by ſoothing them in their Error, to engage them faſter to it. Wherefore the Proteſtants ought not to fetch an Argument (as ſome moſt unreaſonably do) for the Truth of their Religion from their having (as they imagin) a greater Charity than Catholics, ſince it muſt firſt be proved, that their Religion is true, before it will appear, that the Catholics want Charity in condemning it.

Laſtly, If it muſt paſs for a Sign of Charity to think well of more Religions than one, the *Turkiſh* Tenets will have the advantage of the Nine and Thirty Articles, foraſmuch as the Mahometans declare, that every one will be ſaved in his own Religion, and the Articles on the other ſide confine Salvation to the * Chriſtians only. But both theſe *Charitable* Religions muſt give way to the *Origeniſts*, who will have neither Men nor Devils to be *Eternally* Damned.

* *See* 18*th. Article.*

Wherefore it is apparent, that this plauſible pretence of *Greater Charity* weakens not the force of the forementioned Argument, but leaves it Such, as that the moſt cautious Chriſtian may ſafely repoſe on it; Nay, the more *cautious* a Man is in his everlaſting concerns, the better and ſafer this Argument will appear to him. For, thoſe who have a quicker Senſe of their Temporal Intereſts, than

their

their Spiritual, will not ſo much conſult, what is ſafe for their Souls as what is ſecure for their Eſtates. And if both cannot be made ſure alike they will truſt a ſcanty probability (or rather an Improbability) with the former, ſo that they may have Demonſtration (which yet, Gods knows, can be but Imaginary) for the latter.

Now, what would Dr. *Teniſon* have me do in theſe circumſtances? Would he have me Read the Scriptures? *I read them*: Would he have me peruſe the Fathers? *I did it without his advice.* Would he have me make uſe of (what he calls) * Miniſterial Guides? *I heard the Inſtructions of the Engliſh Clergy for many Years.* Would he have me pray? *I looked on Prayer as the chief means of obtaining true Faith, and therefore omitted it not.* Would he have me be humble? *In this Point I can only ſay, that during this ſearch I had ſo mean an Opinion of my own underſtanding, that I could not but conclude, that Almighty God, whoſe Providential care appeared in all other things, had likewiſe provided ſome* * *Guide for me, that I might not Err in ſo important a concern, as that muſt needs be, without which it was impoſſible to pleaſe him*, viz. * *Faith.*

* Pag. 18.

* *Such a guide muſt be one who could not Err himſelf* (i. e.) *Infallible.*

* Ut ſupra *Hebr.* 11. 6.

Wherefore having thus far obſerved (as I ſuppoſe) the Doctors directions, what would he have me do after all? Doth he require the interior Senſe, he ſpeaks of, *pa.* 10? *That alſo pleaded for the Roman Catholics.* And now, if this be all he looks after, would he have me (according to what he ſays, *p.* 15.) *at laſt* Judge for my ſelf? Why then, *I do Judge, and Pronounce too, (I mean* for my ſelf*) that Holy Scriptures, Antient Fathers and Common Reaſon are all for the Roman Catholics, and againſt the Proteſtants.*

And what ſhall interpoſe between this Sentence and it's Execution, I mean, between Concluding, that the Roman Catholic Religion is the beſt, and Embracing it as ſuch? Doth the Church of *England* pretend, that I ought to ſubmit my private Judgment to her Public Deciſions? *She doth not: Nor, if ſhe did, would Dr.* Teniſon *be her Advocate.*

And therefore to conclude, if Dr. *T*---. (being as I conceive, no great friend to Retractations of this kind) will ſtill affirm, that I departed from the Church of *England* on *falſe Principles*, he muſt at leaſt acknowledge, that thoſe *principles* were ſuch as I had received from her. So that in effect I am cenſured by my Teachers for doing that very thing, which they Taught me to do. An hard caſe and that which certainly muſt prevail with us to obſerve our Saviours Command in being * *aware* of ſuch Teachers for the future!

* Matth. c. 7. v. 15.

I have ſaid nothing here (*at leaſt*, directly) of the marks of the True Church, *viz. Unity, Holineſs, Univerſality, Perpetuity, Converſion of Infidels* and the like, nor of many other things, which concurr'd at that time to convince me of the truth of of the Religion I embraced: But thus much I have ſaid, that, ſince Dr. *Teniſon* hath been pleaſed to make the World acquainted with my Converſion, it may not be wholly ignorant of thoſe Motives which occaſioned it. And ſince we are Commanded * to give a Reaſon of the hope, which is in us, to every one that asks, when we are upbraided with our change in this public manner, the public ſeems to demand this Reaſon, and conſequently we ſeem to lie under an obligation of rendring it. Which, I hope will excuſe me with my

* *Ready always to ſatisfie every one that asketh you a Reaſon of that Hope which is in you,* 1 Pet. c. 3. v. 15.

my Readers, for so long a Comment on the Doctors Text.

And now (to return to my Remarks) methinks Dr. *Tenison* conceiving, that I had left his Church for want of due Information, ought not to have press'd so much for my being excluded from that Conference, but rather to have been glad of this opportunity, wherein by his great Learning he might have rectified my understanding and been a means of reducing me to one of his two fair Flocks, *viz.* to *St. Martins* in the *Fields*, or St. *James Westminster*: For tho' those Flocks are so numerous, that one stray Sheep can hardly be found missing, yet (we know) it was the property heretofore of a good Shepherd to leave the Ninty Nine, that he might seek after the Hundredth [this being, perhaps, in former days a competent number for one Shepherd] I say, it had been a clearer sign not only of the Doctors Charity, but also of his confidence in the goodness of his cause, to have admitted me to his Conference, than to pretend *my turning Roman Catholic through Ignorance*, as an Argument, for the sending me away, and consequently, depriving me of (what he ought to think) an opportunity of being better informed.

But perhaps, the Doctor who thought this Conference * *to no purpose as to the Boy*, for his having been at Mass two Months before, concluded that it would be less available with me, who had been many years since, not only at Mass (as many

* Pa. 3. *And yet D. T. was displeased with Mr. P for proposing a Rule of Faith for the Subject of that Conference, because it was not that point which the Boy had mentioned to him, viz. of* Luther, *whereas had he designed a more public Good (as he seems to pretend, Mr. P's Question was the more proper.*

* Who else are those who carry intelligence from the Masshouse, to Dr. Horneck? p. 79.

* Protestants daily are) but also actually reconciled to the Church of *Rome*. And indeed, for as much as concerns this Point, I am perswaded that the Doctor is not out in his Observations: For let but a Man be truly Converted to the Roman Catholic Faith (I do not say for two Months, but) for one single moment, and it will be impossible for all the Doctors in *England* to remove him from it, till such time as his own negligence and ingratitude shall oblige Almighty God to withdraw this *Marvellous Light* from him. And it is on this account, that I have often said amongst my Protestant acquaintance, that *I wished they were but Catholics for one half hour.*

* Pag. 5.

Dr. *Tenison* says, that those who forsake the Church of *England* for the Church of *Rome*, are * *more partial, and possessed with a Spirit of fiercer Bigottry than those who are Romanists from the beginning.*

It is indeed usual for Converts to shew somewhat more of warmth in Religion, than they had before their Conversion, [or perhaps, than some who owing their Faith to their Birth and Education, have not yet sufficiently considered the value of it.] One of the most essential proprieties of Goodness is to be Communicative, and therefore as soon as Men are brought to the true Faith, one of the first desires which they perceive in themselves, is that of the Conversion of others. * *Tu aliquando Conversus* (said our Blessed Saviour to St. *Peter*) *confirma fratres tuos.* The *Samaritan* Woman as soon as she was Converted, left her Employment,

* When thou art once Converted, confirm thy Brethren, Luke c. 22. v. 32.

and

* and ran to call her Neighbors. And it is not without Myſtery, that the Holy Ghoſt is careful to Record of ſeveral Converts in the Goſpel, that when they believed, * their whole Houſhold believed with them.

* *The Woman therefore left her Water-pot, &c.* John c. 4. v. 28.
* *See* ibid. v. 53.

This indeed is a zeal ſo proper to Converts, that where nothing of it appears, the Converſion is ſhrewdly to be ſuſpected: Eſpecially, when it ſhall ſo happen, that the cauſes of *Pretence*, are more apparent, than the Symptoms of *Reality*.

And it is this *zeal* (as I conjecture) which the Doctor calls *Bigottry*. Wherein he imitates the reſt of the World, who think it ſufficient, for the diſcredit of a Vertue, to miſ name it. Such, I mean, as give the Title of *Niggardlineſs* to *Temperance*, of *Sheepiſhneſs* to *Modeſty*, of *Folly* to *Conſcientiouſneſs*, and laſtly, (where the Doctor falls in with them) of *Bigottry* to *Chriſtian Zeal*.

And probably it was this Zeal, which rendred the Boy *ſo* * *uneaſie to his fellow Servants*, [thoſe who are looſer in their manners being ſeldom complained of for this kind of *troubleſomeneſs*] For, Men are generally ſo much in love with the enjoyments of this life, that whoſoever talks to them of the laſt Reckoning Day, and that care wherewith they ought to provide for it, is but very ill Company. And ſo, often-times, we forfeit the love of our friends, by ſhewing them ours. And (believe me) there can never be a greater Demonſtration of our Affection for them, than when we hazard the loſs of their kindneſs to us, which is our Good, for the ſake of their Salvation, which (ſetting aſide the Merit of a Good Work) is purely their own.

* Pag. 2.

But whereas the Doctor fancies, that original

Romaniſts

Romaniſts would be more propitious to his Party than Converts: If I may gueſs by my own experience, he is much miſtaken. It has been my obſervation, that ſome who have been bred Catholics from the beginning, having never been without that clearneſs wherewith the Truth of our Holy Faith is repreſented to them, are very hardly to be perſuaded, but that ſuch Proteſtants as Dr. *Tenniſon, viz. Men of ſome Learning*, muſt needs know that they are in the wrong, and conſequently, perſiſting in it, be Hypocrites. And indeed, the Motives for the Catholic Faith are ſo palpably evident throughout all the Writings of the Antient Fathers and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, (which ought to come into the hands of thoſe who pretend to the Study of Divinity) that I believe I ſhould have been very apt to have Joyned with them in this cenſure, had I been unacquainted with the prejudices of Inclination, Education and Intereſt, or with thoſe obſcurities which they never fail of bringing upon the mind: Whereunto may be added, that blindneſs, which God Almighty often * inflicts on us for the puniſhment of our other Sins. But as it is, and in regard that I have been under the ſame circumſtances, tho' not with ſo much Learning, *haud ignarus mali, miſeris ſuccurrere diſco* [I have ſpoiled the Verſe, that I might not Err in the * Gender, the Doctor being, as I ſee, curious in thoſe matters] I have now learnt to have compaſſion for Thoſe as perſons deceiv'd, whom otherwiſe I might have abhorred as Diſſemblers.

* Spargit Deus pœnales cæcitates ſuper illicitas cupiditates. *Aug. confeſſ.*

* Pag. 10.

And when the Doctor ſhall have conſidered theſe things well, I believe that if the *Sincerity* of his

his Profession should come to be tryed by a Jury of Catholics, he would not prefer Original ones before Converts.

No Gentlemen, Converts are not fiercer towards you, than other Catholics, but you deal less fiercely with others than with them; the Yellowness which appears to a Jaundic'd person is not in the Object but in his Eye. The fierceness is in your breast towards the Converts, and not in theirs towards you. And this the Doctor knows well enough, and therefore hath recommended me under so advantagious a Character to the acquaintance of his Parishioners. Which (as he thinks) will stand me in some stead another day.

Now it is not hard to guess at the Reason, why Converts are more severely handled by their Protestant Neighbors than other Catholics: [*and the nearer, for the most part, the Neighbr-hood, or Relation is, the rougher the usage.*] It is because, when a Protestant is Converted, we are more sensibly put in mind of what we ought to do, than by those who have never been otherwise than Catholics. [And by a Neighbor, or Kinsman, still more *sensibly* than by a stranger, or one at a distance] We are disturbed by such an Example in that drousie Principle, *that every one ought to continue in that Church wherein he was* * *Baptized.* And we are such stupid Lovers of ease, that we are angry at such as endeavor to awaken us out of our Sleep, at least till we come to be thoroughly *awake*, and so understand, that had it not been for this Charitable *Troublesomeness*, we should have been burnt in our Beds. I say, this Principle, of *abiding in that Communion where we once are*, is more immediately

* *Some go farther, and say, that Men ought to continue in that Religion wherein they were Educated, whether it be Christian, or not.*

diately attack'd by Converts than by others, and therefore of consequence the Converts are more displeasing to those, who have made a shift to lay their Consciences a-sleep upon it. And yet how much soever this Principle is belov'd at present, it is that which the Protestants (if they have any kindness for their Religion) have no reason to be fond of, since, if this Rule had been always observed, their Reformation had not been, and consequently, the World had still continued without any Protestants at all.

There is yet one remark which offers it self to me concerning this Aspersion which the Doctor is pleased to cast on all Converts, *viz.* That it reflects on me in very good Company: But I will not insist on this, least the Doctor who confesses, he is apt to be *Suspicious, should have a fresh occasion of suspecting (as he did at the Conference) that I intend to inform against him: However for the future (as I told him then) I would have him take a little more time to consider, before he speaks.

* *Ep. to his Parishioners.*

When the Doctor told me, that *I had been turn'd in* Spain, *where the People had no Bibles*, what I replyed was very true, *viz.* that going over in the Company of a public Minister, we had the liberty of using what Books we pleased, and consequently, we carried with us not only Bibles, but a great number of other English Books and amongst them many of our best Protestant Controvertists. And I farther inform the Doctor, that during my forementioned doubts, I frequently perused the Writings of those Men, and particularly of *Chillingworth* whom

whom I looked on as the ſubtileſt of them all, and the Fountain-head from whence Dr. *St.* and moſt others of our Modern Controverſie-writers had derived their Notions. And before my Converſion, to the beſt of my remembrance, I never Read one line in any Roman Catholic Controvertiſt (having always an in-bred averſion to, and a fear of being deceived by them) unleſs the Doctor will take the Antient Fathers to be ſuch, as indeed, he very well may.

But after all, why ſhould the Doctor ſay, that I have *forſaken* his Church? Does a Man leave the Houſe, who goes out of one Room into another? The *Learned Dr.* Jackſon (as he is * Quoted by *the Learned* Dr. *Teniſon*) ſays, that *the Church of* England *was in the Romiſh Church before* Luthers *time, and is yet in it.* Now, how have I left the Church of *England*, when both the Church of *England* and my ſelf are in the ſame Church? *London* is no farther from *Paris*, than *Paris* is from *London.* If the Church of *England* could come ſo far from the Church of *Rome*, as ſhe hath done by her Reformation, without Separating from her (as the Doctor ſeems to * affirm;) may not a Church of *England*-man go all that way back again without ſeparating from the Church of *England*? If the Denying of *Tranſubſtantiation*, break no Union with thoſe who Hold it; how comes the Holding it to diſ-unite us from thoſe who Deny it? Wherefore the Doctor might have ſpared his Third Exception againſt me at this time, and firſt conſidered whether the matter on which it was grounded were true, or not.

* Pag. 58.

* Ibid.

But the Churches of *Rome* and *England* must be *two distinct Churches*, when it is for the Doctors turn: And *One and the same* when a contrary purpose requires it. That is, when my Apostacy is to be proved, they are *two*; and when the Doctor's Succession is to be made out, they are but *One*. It was not without cause, that the Antients said, *Oportet mendacem esse Memorem*, since it is so very hard, for much to be spoken in the Defence of Falshood without the stumbling upon some Contradiction or other.

It is not impossible, but Dr. *T.* may Answer what is added by his aboveſaid *Learned* Brother, *viz.* that the English Church is in the Church of *Rome*, *neither as a Visible Church altogether distinct from it, nor any Native Member of it.* But this, (to say nothing of the fancifulness of the Notion) will not serve for the Doctors excuse. For he charges me roundly to have forsaken the Church of *England*, whereas (according to this Learned Man) he ought to have said, that I had not *altogether* left it, but had still, at least one foot in it's Communion, or some such like Church of *England*-Oracle, which, like their *Real Presence*, might have been interpreted either way. This is not trifling (tho' it may seem so at first sight) but a clear Manifestation of what most naturally proceeds from the admirable *Harmony* of Protestant Doctrins.

I have now done with the Doctors Preliminary Exceptions: But before I pass to any other part of his Account, I will do him so much right as to acknowledge, that I am verily persuaded, that he made these Exceptions not out of much malice towards

wards me, or for any great weight he imagined to be in them, but meerly to ſpend the time, and amuſe the Auditors, or, it may be, to diſcompoſe his Antagoniſts, and render them leſs preſent to themſelves: Such Salutations (ordinarily ſpeaking) being but an ill tuning of the mind for calm and ſerious Diſcourſes. For (as I have already hinted) if Dr. *Teniſon* had thought it both unreaſonable and inconvenient, that I ſhould be preſent at the Conference, why had he not accepted of that perſon, whom Mr. *P.* propoſed in my ſtead, or otherwiſe inſiſted on it, that I ſhould have withdrawn; which I aſſure him, had been no leſs a favor to me, than he could think it a convenience to himſelf?

Dr. *T.* ſays in the beginning of his *6th. page*, that Mr. *P.* [after his ſitting down] *ſpake firſt about Pen and Ink, and an* Amanuenſis, *but* Dr. *T. having brought no perſon with him, and the Crowd preſſing*, Mr. *P. began a Verbal Conference, by ſaying the Proteſtants had no Bible, deſiring* Dr. *T. to prove they had one, and asking him how, and whence they had one, and what was their Rule of Faith.* Pag. 6.

This looks, as if there had been but a ſlight mention made of having the Arguments taken in Writing, and that it was after our ſitting down, and only by Mr. *P.* and that Mr. *P.* without inſiſting much for it had begun a Verbal Conference: Whereas both Mr. *P.* and my ſelf were very earneſt for it, and propoſed it before our ſitting down; Nay, it was on this propoſal of ours, that the Doctor invited us to ſit down, after having firſt told us, that he had no Pen and Ink, nor Writer, *&c.* According to what I have ſaid above *p.* 14.

Possibly Mr. *P.* might mention this again after he sat down, tho' I do not remember it.

Moreover, after this first *sitting down*, the Doctor added two of his Objections against me, and offered at some Preliminary things as he called them. And it was after these Discourses (tho' they are omitted as trivial in Mr. *P---s* account) that Mr. *P.* began his Argumentation, and not immediately after the proposal of having it Written (as Dr. *T.* says) for Mr. *P.* perceiving, that the Doctor had a mind to consume the time in unprofitable Cavils, endeavored to cut him short, by putting him in remembrance of the business, for which they had met.

I mention these particulars, that the *not admitting* of this Proposal of *Writing*, may appear (what truly it was) the Doctors Tergiversation. Had Mr. *P.* been then as well acquainted with Dr. *T.* as he is now, he would absolutely have refused the Conference, had not his desire of *Writing* been yielded to. And this is the resolution, which he has taken for the future: Which, in my judgment, is but *shutting the Stable-door, after the Steed is Stolen*: For (I believe) he is never like to have the Doctors Company on such hard terms, notwithstanding that he seems to offer *p.* 70. what he refused at the Conference.

Whereas he says, Mr. *P. began a Verbal Conference, by saying the Protestants had no Bible.* It was not so: For, he began the Conference, by desiring the Doctor to Assign his Rule of Faith: Having first given us some account, how the Youth (for whose sake the Conference was) came to entertain thoughts of making himself a Member of the

the Roman Catholic Church. And to that Propoſition (after much debate concerning theſe Deſires in the Youth) the Doctor replyed (being again and again preſſed to it by Mr. *P.*) that *his Rule of Faith was the Holy Scripture.* And it was on this Anſwer, that Mr. *P.* asked the Doctor, *how he could prove, that the Book which he called Holy Scripture, was truly ſuch,* and not before, as it is made by the Doctors Account; which (as I have complained before) is one of the moſt intricate things I ever met with, and no more like the Conference, than it is uſual for the new hands at Cards (after the Pack is well ſhuffled) to be like the former ones. The Cards, it is true, are all the ſame, but their places being changed, the Games are different. I do not ſay, that this *Account* is more confuſed than the Conference, but the confuſion has quite another ſhape, or figure than it had.

But the matter of Fact being cleared, as above, it becomes more evident, how much Dr. *Teniſon* diſſembled, when inſtead of proving his Bible to be true Scripture, as was deſired, he offered *to diſpute out of that Book which Mr.* P. *ſhould own to be Scripture,* ſince it could not but be manifeſt to him, that Mr. *P.* did not only ask him for the proof of thoſe places, wherein his Bible differs from ours, but for the proof of the whole, or if he had demanded a proof of ſuch places only, it was not for the ſake of any Arguments which the Proteſtants take thence for the defence of their Religion, but that it might appear on what Teſtimony they had received the Scripture, and conſequently on what grounds their Reformation had proceeded. And therefore when to avoid this proof he offered to Pag. 6.

diſpute

diſpute out of Mr. *P*'s Bible (which he might eaſily have done by the help of his own Interpretation) it was a plain (tho', with the Rabble, a very plauſible) evaſion.

* Ibid. *This* * *Method* [viz. *of Diſputing out of Mr.* P's *Bible*] ſays the Doctor, *Mr.* P. *would not allow, but repeated his Diſcourſe about our not having a Bible, and our not being able if we had one, to prove we had one; and asked again about the Rule of our Faith. Dr.* T. *before he anſwered to this, applyed himſelf to Mr.* M. (*who ſeem'd to be the calmer perſon*, &c.

Here the Doctor diſcovers his way of Diſputing. How comes the Doctor to *apply himſelf to Mr.* M. whereas Mr. *P.* had begun his Conference with him, and propoſed the main Queſtion of it? How come we not to receive an Anſwer to this Queſtion till two or three Pages full of *wrangling* after it was propoſed, nor then neither (as he confeſſes, *p.* 9.) till Mr. *P.* and Mr. *M.* not ſuffering him to tell a Story, preſſed him to it, nor even then (as he farther * owns) till he had chid Mr. *P.* for *asking him Queſtions, and ſeeming to Catechize him.* Surely after ſo long an Expectation the Anſwer muſt needs be extraordinary.

* Pag. 9.

In the next place, how comes Mr. *M.* tho' a Convert, and * *poſſeſſed with a Spirit of fiercer Bigottry* than other Romaniſts, to be *the calmer perſon?* But Dr. *T.* wants an excuſe for turning away from his Antagoniſt, and ſpeaking to one who (as he was told at the beginning) was to have no part in the Diſpute. And as for the Complement, he is reſolved, that I ſhall pay dear for it, before he

* Pag. 5.

parts

parts with me. Besides, some such appearance of Candor (the common Artifice of Detractors) is necessary for the obtaining a belief to the basest of Calumnies which is to * follow.

* Pag. 23.

Dr. T. * *put Mr.* M. *in mind, that such Discourses as these* [concerning the proof of Holy Scripture] *and some others lately used by the Romanists about the* Trinity *and* Transubstantiation, *would rather make the People Atheists or Unbelievers, than Converts. And that the Indifferent were ready to say, Content: We cannot believe Transubstantiation, and we will have no Trinity; We cannot have the Bible unless we take it upon Roman Authority, and none we will have. Mr.* M. *said, That would not be the consequence; but gave no reason why he said so.*

* Pag. 6.

But Mr. *M.* can give a very good reason, why he then gave none. It is, because before he could pronounce six words, Dr. *T.* turn'd back again to Mr. *P.* And it was not for one (as I have intimated already) who looked on himself as wholly unconcerned in the Controversie, to interrupt it so far, as to press the Doctor to hearken to him.

What I would have then said (had the Doctor been pleased to stay for it) was, That those who would give themselves leave to consider, would find so good Authority in the Roman Church, for the belief of the Trinity, and the Holy Scripture, that tho' there were no other Authority for them (as indeed there is none) yet this alone would be sufficient. And consequently, that there would be no danger of Atheism, but where Obstinacy and Perverseness should interpose, which would never leave

Men

Men deſtitute of a *Pretence* for Incredulity, tho' they ſhould want a *juſt reaſon* for it ever ſo much. I ſhould have added, that it was an excellent Argument of the Truth of a Religion, when it could be ſhewn, that either ſuch a Religion was *True*, or elſe that none was ſo. Wherefore if it could be proved, that on the denyal of this *Roman Authority* (as the Doctor calls it) Men would have no reaſon to believe a God, it muſt needs have followed, that the *Roman Authority* was not to be denyed.

Beſides: An *Arian* might have upbraided the Antient Catholics after the ſame manner and ſaid, that ſo much inſiſting on the neceſſity of believing a Trinity, *would rather make the People Atheiſts or Unbelievers, than Converts.* And that the Indifferent would be ready to ſay, content: *We cannot believe the* Trinity, *and we will have no* Deity. *For* Athanaſius *tells us, that it will ſtand us in little ſtead to believe a God, unleſs we alſo believe (what is plainly repugnant to our Reaſon) a* Trinity *of perſons in an Unity of Subſtance.* And this Diſcourſe would not have been leſs concluſive in the *Arians* Mouth, than it was in the Doctors.

This was the Anſwer, which the Doctor by the Spirit of Prophecy thought not worth the tarrying for, and therefore faced about to Mr. *P.* Which I ſhould not have complained of, had it been to have Anſwered Mr. *P's.* Queſtion. But inſtead of this, to ſhew how ſollicitous he was for the Diſcovery of Truth in ſo important a Point as a Rule of Faith he * falls into an inſignificant cavil. Where I leave him, it being too troubleſome for me to trace him through all his turnings and windings.

* Pag. 6. *near the end.*

ings. However, what is here ſaid, may ſerve to give the Reader ſome kind of Notion of them.

He ſays, *p.* 14. *Mr. M. had ſome while before aſked Dr. T. (who had ſaid, that we find the Bible, which we now have, Quoted by the Antient Fathers) how he came to know they were Fathers? To which Queſtion he thought an Anſwer in that place a condeſcention to an Impertinence.* Pag. 14.

The Doctor had been asked, upon what Authority or Teſtimony [for the Doctor diſtinguiſhes between them] he had received his Bible. He anſwered (amongſt other things) that *he found his Bible Quoted by the Antient Fathers.* Now, I conſidered that the Fathers, and their works ſtood in need of ſome Teſtimony themſelves for their being relyed on. And therefore I asked the Doctor, how he knew they were Fathers? By *Fathers*, I ſuppoſe he meant *Orthodox Biſhops* or *Doctors* of the Church. Wherefore the meaning of my Queſtion was, how he could prove thoſe whom he accounted Fathers to be Orthodox? If he ſhould have ſaid, that they had been allowed to be ſuch by all Chriſtians; It would have been denyed him, there having been, and ſtill being ſeveral Societies of ſuch as Profeſs Chriſtianity who aſſert the contrary. And therefore unleſs the Doctor could give us a mark whereby we might know which ſort of Chriſtians are in the right, and which in the wrong, it would be impoſſible for us to underſtand from their Teſtimony whether the Fathers were *Orthodox* or not.

If he ſhould have replyed, that theſe Fathers were approved by *our ſelves*; That alſo would

have been as little to his purpoſe. For, if he looks on our Authority as *Good*, he ought to receive ſeveral other things upon it, which he does not. And if he takes it not to be *ſuch*, he cannot confide in it either for Scripture or Fathers. Since here, they are not Arguments *ad hominem* (or concerning only the Private difference between us and them) but general Arguments which we require of them. I mean ſuch, as may ſerve to evidence the certainty of Holy Writ to the whole World. And if the Doctor would have granted, that this could have been done by our Authority, it may eaſily be believed, that we ſhould have asked no more.

Laſtly, If he ſhould have ſaid, that he knew thoſe Antient Fathers to be Orthodox no otherwiſe, than by the Conformity which he obſerved in their Tenets to the Doctrin of the Scriptures (which is the Proteſtant way of proving the Orthodoxneſs of either particular Men or Churches) he would have involved himſelf in a Circle, by proving the Fathers to be true from their agreement with the Scriptures, and the Scriptures to be ſo from the approbation of the Fathers.

By this time, I ſuppoſe, it ſufficiently appears to unbyaſs'd Readers, that Doctor *Tenison* would have ſhewed his Learning more by Anſwering this Queſtion, than he has done his Manners, by calling it Impertinent.

Here I cannot but take notice, that this Queſtion of mine is inſerted in a wrong place, to make People believe, that I was preſent to ſo much of the Conference: Whereas I am as certain, as my memory can

can make me, that I heard none of those Discourses from the middle of the Doctors 10th. Page, till towards the latter end of his 17th. When the Doctors loud Clamors about the Quotation out of St. *Ambrose* brought me back from the Window, whither I had retired long before, *viz.* before the aboveſaid Diſcourſes which begin at the middle of the Tenth Page. I ſay, I was preſent to none of thoſe Diſcourſes between the middle of the Tenth, and the latter end of the 17th. Page, excepting ſomewhat which is miſ-placed, *viz.* Mr, *P*'s Reprehenſion of the School-maſter for his *Wry Mouths, &c.* which was ſoon after the beginning of the Conference, and a little while before I withdrew: But the Doctor ſets it down in this place, that the People may not imagin, that the School-maſter came ſo ſoon to his Aſſiſtance, as in Truth he did. Neither was this Reprehenſion occaſioned (as the Doctor would have it) by any Diſcourſe concerning the *Lateran* Council which was not then ſpoken to, but on the School-maſters producing a Picture in a Breviary, and (to ſhew his Wit) laughing at it. Which was an action no way pertinent to the matter then in debate. And therefore the Doctor, to diſguiſe the School-maſters intruſion, ſays nothing of the Diſcourſe, which happened about the Picture. *It is unhappy* (ſays the Doctor *p.* 65.) *that amidſt ſo many things we can have nothing ſincere, and in it's Naturals.* The reaſon of it is, becauſe in ſuch occaſions the Truth is ſeldom honorable for both ſides. And I queſtion not, but the Doctor is convinced by this time, that he was much in the right, when he choſe rather to truſt his own Memory, than his own Amanuenſis. Pag. 15.

Concerning what he ſays, *p.* 14. *viz. Mr.* M. *asked what Writers?* I do not remember that Queſtion, neither did I hear the Diſcourſe of that Paragraph. What he ſaid alſo to me in Derogation of Mr. *P.* tho' he hath it, *p.* 15. was a long time after. But the Doctor is reſolved to ſpread my Controverſie through his whole Narrative, tho' by this means it be very thin, and neither much for my credit, nor his: It is poſſible, that the Doctor thinks to help it out, by putting my Name at length, ſo * often as he doth, throughout this famous Story, whereas the reſt of the perſons of his *Drama* (excepting only *one*, as I take it) have only the firſt Letter of Theirs. However leſt the Doctor ſhould deſign a Favor by it (tho' his not dealing ſo by his *moſt worthy Friends* might make one think otherwiſe) and ſince (whilſt I am contented to yield to him in Contumely and Abuſe) I am reſolved not to come one jot behind him in Point of Courteſie, I have deſired the Printer to pay him the ſame Reſpect, as often as he can do it conveniently: That his NAME may rumble as much in my Pamphlet, as mine doth in his. And altho' this ſhould prove to be a ſign of ill Will (for I know not what to make of it) our Spleen would not be miſ-placed upon the Doctors *Name*, ſince it is *That* which has done us Ten times more harm than his Arguments, tho' indeed ever ſince his late Book, we have ſome reaſon to hope, that it's Authority is much leſſened with all Thoſe, whoſe minds are at liberty to Conſider.

* *Six times in two Pages.*

There is one thing which, with my Readers Licenſe,

Licence, I desire to take notice of, before I pass on to the remainder of the Doctors Relation, which is the gross fallacy wherewith some Protestant Divines are wont to delude the Common People, whensoever they are called upon by Catholics to shew, on what Authority they receive the Holy Scripture. *The Papists* (say they) *question the Authority of Scripture.* Again, when it is alledged, that the Scripture left to the Interpretation of each private person can decide no Point of Controversie, since doubtlesly every one will declare, that the Scripture is for him; and in effect he does declare it by holding his particular Tenet (whatsoever it be) as grounded on Scripture. I say, when this is urged; They cry, *The Scripture is undervalued by the Papists.* And this makes such deep Impression on the unthinking Multitude (or, shall I say, strikes such a damp on their Spirits) that many times it surpasses the skill of the ablest and plainest Logician to undeceive them. And yet it is not because they *cannot* think Rationally enough to discern the Fallacy, but because they *will not*; since there is no understanding amongst them so dull or short-sighted, but if it be made use of, must see through it.

None can have a greater respect for the Holy Scripture, than Catholics have. I my self have known several of them beyond-Sea, who amongst their other Devotions Reading some part of the Holy Scripture every day, to shew their profound Veneration for it, were always wont to Read it on their Knees; which whosoever observes, and compares with that very indifferent behaviour, wherewith it is ordinarily handled here in *England*, will

will not ſay that Catholics have a leſs regard for the Holy Scripture, than Proteſtants. And conſequently, they do as little queſtion it's Authority.

Why then do the Catholics urge the Proteſtants to ſhew on what Authority or Teſtimony they receive the Bible, ſince it's Authority is undoubted on both ſides? It is, becauſe the Catholics would take this occaſion of ſhewing their Adverſaries, that of neceſſity a True and Uncorrupted Church muſt be allowed to have been in the World, when they began their pretended Reformation, *viz.* about a hundred and fifty years ago. For, ſince they received their Bible from ſome Church then in the World; in caſe there were at that time no true nor uncorrupted Church, it muſt follow, that they had no good Authority for their Bible. And on the contrary, if the Proteſtants will own that they received their Bible from good hands, they muſt acknowledge, that they had it from a True Church, and conſequently, that there was ſuch a one in the World when they began to Reform. And from hence it will immediately follow, that the firſt Reformers ſeparating from the whole World, (as hath been ſaid) did alſo ſeparate from the True Church which (as we here ſuppoſe them to confeſs) was then in it: And therefore muſt be accounted Schiſmatics, unleſs they can give us ſome better Definition of *Schiſm*, than that which hitherto we have had, *viz.* of it's being *a Separation from the Obedience and Communion of the True Church.*

There is yet another Reaſon, why we aſk the Proteſtants, on what Authority they receive the Scriptures. And it is, becauſe we would likewiſe put them

them in mind of what I hinted above, *viz.* that they ought to admit other things, and indeed, the *meaning* of the Scripture, upon the ſame Authority, on which they admit the *letter*. And therefore when they ſay, that they had the Scripture from the Roman Catholics, we tell them, that if the Roman Catholics may be relyed on for the reception of the Scripture, they may be credited for other Doctrins. If they are bad Witneſſes, no part of their Teſtimony can be valid. Wherefore if any part of it be ſo, they muſt be look'd on as *Good* Witneſſes, and conſequently their whole Teſtimony ought to be embraced. And this is another cauſe of this Queſtion.

But why do the Catholics derogate ſo much from the moſt abundant Perfection of Holy Scripture, as to affirm that it is inſufficient of it ſelf to decide our Controverſies in Faith? It is, becauſe the daily and palpable experience of Mankind Teaches it to be ſo. Neither is it any derogation to a Law, to ſay, that it ſtands in need of what never yet any Law was without, *viz.* A *Judge*, or *Interpreter* of it.

And I wonder, that the Proteſtants, who confeſs that every Man is fallible, and as ſuch may be miſtaken in the Senſe of Scripture, *and that*, to his Damnation, ſhould look on it as a Derogation to the ſame Scripture, to think that God (whoſe Mercy is over all his Works) hath appointed ſome means to keep us from being ſo miſtaken. Eſpecially when this help is not ſo much for the Scripture, as for our underſtandings. It arguing no more a defect in thoſe ſacred Volums, that our narrow Intellects are not able to comprehend their meaning without an Interpreter

(as

(as it fared with the * *Eunuch* ſpoken of in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*) than it doth a fault in a good Print, that it cannot be Read by weak Eyes without the aſſiſtance of a Glaſs.

To conclude, if it be a Derogation to the Scripture to ſay, that it ſtands in need of ſomewhat beſides it ſelf for it's being underſtood by us; How will thoſe Proteſtants defend themſelves, who affirm that *Prayer*, *Humility* and * *Miniſterial Guides* are neceſſary for this purpoſe? What greater affront is it to the Scripture to declare, that it cannot be underſtood without the Authority of the Church, than it is to ſay, that it cannot be underſtood without Miniſterial Guides? Nor even with them (according to Proteſtants) any more than *fallibly*; which is, in truth, not to be underſtood at all; for, how can a Man be ſaid to know the meaning of a thing, whilſt he doubts whether he know it, or not; as all thoſe muſt do, who conſider that they are Fallible, and therefore may be Miſtaken in their Interpretations?

There is alſo another ſuppoſed Irreverence towards the Holy Scripture, that the Catholics are accuſed of, which conſiſts in this, that they make the Tradition of the Church to be of equal credit with it. On this Point I ſhall only ask this ſhort Queſtion, *viz.* Whether it be not as much to be believed, that St. *Matthews* Goſpel is the word of God, which is the Tradition of the Church; as it is, that our Saviour Faſted Forty Days and Forty Nights, which is part of that Goſpel? If it be (as I preſume none will deny) then it muſt follow, that *Tradition*, which is the unwritten Word of God, muſt oblige us to believe, as much, as *Scripture*

* *And* Philip *ran thither to him* [*the* Eunuch] *and heard him Read the Prophet* Eſaias, *and ſaid, underſtandeſt thou what thou Readeſt? And he ſaid, how can I, except ſome Man ſhould guide me?* &c. Act. c. 8. v. 30. 31.

* *See* Pa. 18.

ture which is his written Word. And, indeed who is there that can doubt but that heretofore, the Apoſtles Sermons and Verbal directions (and that which the Faithful remembred of them) were of equal Authority with their Epiſtles and other Writings? Shall we not think, that what was laid up in their Memories was as Obligatory, as that which was committed to Paper, Eſpecially whilſt we hear St. *Paul* Commanding the * *Theſſalonians* to hold faſt thoſe Traditions, which they had learnt, whether it had been by *word* of Mouth, or by *Epiſtle?*

* 2 Theſ. c. 2. v. 15.

On the whole matter I dare boldly affirm, that there is none, who ſhall impartially conſider what hath been ſaid here, but will perceive, that the Catholics have a greater reſpect for the Holy Scripture than the Proteſtants, and this, with relation both to it's *Authority* and *Uſefulneſs*.

Firſt, As to it's Authority [I mean, it's *Authentickneſs*] the Catholics Declare, that it hath been handed from the time of the Apoſtles down to ours by a True and Uncorrupted Church. Whereas the Proteſtants do not allow that they received it from any Society of Chriſtians but ſuch as (according to their own ſentiments) were Corrupted. The Inference of this, and of what follows, is too plain, to need the making.

Secondly, As to it's Uſefulneſs. The Catholics affirm, that God hath left us ſome ſure means of underſtanding it a-right, ſo far forth as it ſhall be neceſſary for our Salvation, whereas the Proteſtants aſſign no other way of underſtanding the Scripture, but what they acknowledge to be Uncertain.

And here I cannot but take notice, that a Bible in

an unknown Tongue, which is capable of being rightly Interpreted, and is daily ſo Interpreted to the Common People, is incomparably of more uſe to them than one in the Vulgar Tongue, which can be underſtood no otherwiſe than *fallibly*, That is (as I have ſaid * above) *cannot be* * *underſtood.* An unknown Tongue which may be Interpreted being certainly leſs inconvenient, than an unknown Senſe which may not be Found out.

* *See above* Pag. 56.

* *And conſequently, indeed can be of no uſe, but rather hurtful.*

Wherefore, if Scripture appear both more *Authentic* and more *Uſeful* by Catholic Tenets, than it doth by Proteſtant, can it be thought to have leſs Reſpect amongſt us, than it has amongſt them?

There is yet another plauſible Pretence which ſerves rather to Amuſe, than Argumentatively to deceive the Common People whenever this Point *viz.* the Teſtimony, on which Holy Scripture is to be received, comes into Debate. They ſay, *that the Holy Scripture hath a ſufficient Authority from it ſelf, that it is diſcerned by it's own Light, and that it's Style, Contexture and Precepts are ſuch, as neceſſarily ſpeak it to be Divine, inſomuch that it ſtands not in any need of being recommended to us by any Extrinſic Teſtimony whatſoever.*

Certainly if this were ſo, the Apoſtles would have had an eaſier task in the Converſion of the World, than it proved to them. They needed only to have Tranſlated their Goſpels into the Languages of all Nations, and ſo by Ordinary Meſſengers to have diſperſed them from one end of the World to the other. And by this means, they might have been in thoſe days as ſparing of their Journeys,

Journeys, as their pretended Succeſſors of the Church of *England* are in theſe. And foraſmuch as concerns thoſe Miraculous Gifts, which were Communicated to them, for the propagation of the Faith, all of them had been Superfluous, excepting only that of Tongues. Their Scripture would have diſcovered it ſelf by it's own Light to be the word of God, and what was Plain in it (according to our Modern Doctrin) would be ſufficient for Salvation. But ſince this was quite otherwiſe, and that the Word of God was heretofore recommended to Mankind by the great Labors, Holy Lives, and frequent Miracles of thoſe who Preached it, and even with all theſe helps found not that Credit with the greateſt part which it ought, we muſt conclude that this Holy word ſtands in need of ſome Extrinſic Teſtimony, ſince at the beginning it pleaſed God (who does no unneceſſary thing) to accompany it with * ſuch, and that even when it came from the Bleſſed Mouth of his own * Son.

* *But they* [*the Apoſtles*] *going forth Preached every where, our Lord working withal, and* Confirming *the* Word *with* Signs *that followed*, Mark c. 16. v. 20. * *The Works that I do in the name of my Father, they give Teſtimony of me*, John c. 10. v. 25. *And again*, ver. 38. *Believe the Works, that you may know and believe that the Father is in me*, &c.

And yet, tho' we ſhould grant that there is ſomewhat ſo admirable in theſe Writings, that foraſmuch as concerns the whole frame of them, it muſt neceſſarily appear (at leaſt, to a well-diſpoſed mind) that they can have no other Author than God himſelf: Will it therefore follow, that every Verſe is ſuch, every Hiſtorical paſſage, or that ſome Syllable or Word may not be added, or taken away in ſome Myſtery of Faith, without breaking

in upon the Majeſty of the Style, or whatever elſe beſpeaks our veneration for this Book? May not (I ſay) ſomewhat of this Nature be done, which may change the Meaning of a Sentence, and yet thence no evidence ariſe that this Sentence ſo changed is not from God?

For further Illuſtration and Proof of what I ſay, let us ſuppoſe that there were two Editions of the Bible, delivered to us by an Extrinſick Teſtimony or Authority ſo equal, that we could not diſcern which Teſtimony were beſt, and that in one of theſe Editions our Saviour's words in the Inſtitution of the Bleſſed Sacrament ſhould be, THIS is a Sign of my Body, and in the other (what they now are) THIS is my Body. Would it appear from the ſound, or any thing elſe, which of theſe two Sentences was ſpoken by Chriſt? I preſume that (conſidering the various opinions which are now in the World concerning this Myſtery) you are ready to ſay, that it would not. Suppoſe then, that I, or any other private perſon ſhould put forth an Edition of the Bible, which ſhould have the former Sentence, *This is a Sign of my Body*, inſtead of the latter, *This is my Body*. It is evident, indeed, that ſuch an Edition, would be of no Credit. But why? Not for any defect in the ſound, or other intrinſic fault (as hath been ſhewn) but becauſe the Authority of one ſingle perſon, which recommends the firſt Sentence, cannot weigh with that of the whole World, which delivers the laſt. For could theſe two Sentences change their Extrinſic Teſtimonies, they would change their Credit alſo.

Much more of this Nature might be added: But we

we need not have Recourſe to Suppoſitions for an Evidence of this Truth, which is ſufficiently confirmed by that Difference in the *Tranſlations* of the Scripture, which is already in the World.

By Difference in Tranſlations, I mean, a Difference in * Senſe, and not in Language, as Dr. *St*---- was pleaſed to Miſtake my meaning, in his ſecond Letter to Mr. *G*---. In which piece for the moſt part he Anſwers my Objections by *miſtaking* them. And certainly Books may be Anſwered with eaſe, when Ignorance it ſelf (as *Miſtaking* is) either Real or Pretended, is able to do the work. The prevention of ſuch *miſtakes* was one of the Reaſons, why I preferr'd Perſonal Conferences before the *Writing* of Books, tho, indeed, for the ſecuring ſuch Conferences from ſuch after miſ-repreſentations, as we have here, I thought it convenient, that what was ſaid in them ſhould be committed to Writing immediately upon the place.

* Viz. *when one Tranſlation hath Words expreſſing a different Senſe from thoſe which are in another.*

I ſay then, that this Difference of Senſe in the ſeveral Tranſlations of the Bible which are now in Being, is an undenyable proof, that the Scripture does not manifeſt it ſelf to us by it's own Luſtre (as is pretended) *at leaſt* in all it's parts: For ſince all theſe Differences of Senſe, expreſſed by Different words, are held for Authentic, by Different Bodies of Chriſtians, whereas at moſt, there can be but one of theſe *Different Expreſſions*, Genuine, or True; it muſt follow, that the Truth of every parcel of Scripture is not evident to All alike, and conſequently not Evident from it ſelf.

And

And indeed, to ſay the truth, I never knew that any ſort of Chriſtians endeavored to juſtifie the preference of their own Verſion before that of others from the Sound or Texture of the Expreſſions, but always from it's Conformity to the Original Languages, Antient Copies, or the like, which they would not have done, could the bare Sound, or Frame have ſufficiently pleaded for it.

What is here proved from the *Difference* in the Tranſlations of the Bible, may be yet farther evinced by that which there is in the number of the Canonical Books; ſince if the Scripture were evident of it ſelf, how come whole Books to be received by ſome, and rejected by others? [And here a new Reaſon offers it ſelf to me, why Proteſtants ſhould be asked more particularly, what Teſtimony they have for their Bible, ſince they lay aſide ſo much of that Canon which was confirmed by the Council of *Carthage*, in the year 397. (ſubſcribed to by St. *Auguſtin*) as alſo by the ſixth General Council, *A. D.* 680. and hath been ſo generally in uſe ever ſince, for want (as they pretend) of that Teſtimony which is ſufficient.

I ſhould deſign an endleſs piece of work, ſhould I purpoſe to ſet down all the abſurdities which neceſſarily are derived from this Aſſertion *viz.* that the Scripture is Proved by it ſelf. *Dato uno abſurdo, mille ſequuntur.* I hope, what I have ſaid, is enough for the rejecting a Poſition, which ought rather to be eſteemed it's own diſ-proof, than the Scripture can be look'd on as it's own Proof: For ſince it is moſt apparent, that the Senſe of all the parts of Holy Scripture is not Plain to us by it's own

Light

Light; how comes it to paſs, that without further help we may know the Words which we Read, to be the Words of the Holy Ghoſt, and not know the Senſe, which we have of them, to be the Senſe intended by the ſame Holy Ghoſt: The Senſe being that which immediately is from God, whereas the words are from Men; At leaſt, in ſuch Tranſlations as are not made by Divine Revelation or Inſpiration; Which, as I take it, the Reformed Church of *England* doth not pretend to? Wherefore I cannot think, that any one will ſay, that the Phraſe, or Form of Words in any place of Scripture is ſuch, as manifeſtly ſhews it ſelf to be from God, and yet that at the ſame time he is ignorant whether the Senſe, which he conceives of thoſe Words, be from God, or from himſelf.

It follows from theſe Conſiderations, That Scripture how Sacred and Divine ſoever it be, is not *manifeſted to us by it's own light*, and, conſequently, it is neither impertinent in it ſelf, nor derogatory to the Scripture, to ask, upon what Extrinſic Teſtimony it is received and acknowledged for Such.

Give me leave to add one word by way of Corollary to what hath been ſaid, which is, that ſeeing the Holy Scriptures are not made Evident by themſelves, and that no Prudent Man can receive any thing upon the credit of Falſe and Corrupted Witneſſes, it muſt be inferred, that the Proteſtant Reformers ought to quit their pretence of *being Guided by Scripture*, ſince they have no other Rule of knowing what is ſuch, and what not, but the bare Letter of that which is called ſo, and the Teſtimony

ny of thoſe, whom they accounted to have ſo much Corruption and Falſneſs, that they ſeparated from them, without the leaſt apprehenſion of the Guilt of Schiſm. For, ſeparating from the whole World (as hath been ſaid) they muſt needs ſeparate from thoſe, upon whoſe Authority or Teſtimony they received their Bible. And this in effect was the ſumm of Mr. *P*'s Argument againſt Dr. *T*.

* Rom. 1. v. 14.

I ſhould not have inſiſted ſo tediouſly on the foregoing points, had I not known that how frivolous ſoever thoſe pretences (of *our vilifying Scripture, looking on it as Inſufficient*, and the like) may ſeem to any thinking Man, yet the common People are moſt groſly, and almoſt incurably deluded by them. And *we are* * *Debtors both to the Wiſe and to the Unwiſe*. And foraſmuch as concerns this laſt Point, which I have ſpoken to, *viz.* the pretended *ſelf-evidence of the Scripture*, it hath dropt in my hearing not only from the Mouths of the middle ſort, but even from thoſe of the *Learned World*. And even Dr. *T*. himſelf glances at it in his Tenth Page: Nothing being more Neceſſitous, or putting a Man upon worſe ſhifts, than an ill Cauſe.

But, tho' I have been very long on this ſubject, yet I cannot but make one Obſervation more, before I proceed to another, which is, that the Proteſtants, when they find themſelves deſtitute of ſolid Proof (as in truth, they always do) for the Support of their peculiar Tenets, are wont to heap a great many Unconcluding things together, that

that ſo (if poſſible) what is wanting in Strength may be made out by Number: Which however like Cyphers, tho' making as great or greater ſhew than Figures, amount to no ſumm. For example (to inſtance in the matter of our preſent Conſideration) when we ask them, how they prove their Bible, They tell us, *by it's own light*, * *Their interior Senſe*, and *by the Teſtimony of* Jews, Turks, Infidels, *and laſtly of whole Bodies of* Erroneous *and* Corrupted * *Chriſtians*; whereas the Catholics have but one poor Teſtimony to oppoſe to all theſe, *viz. That of a true, uncorrupted and uninterrupted Church.*

* See Pag. 9. and 10.

* Viz. *Such Chriſtians as are accounted Erroneous and Corrupted by them.*

Now, it is not every ordinary Head which (at leaſt without ſettling) will ſerve for a juſt Ballance to theſe two Proofs, and not be weighed down by that which is moſt Bulky, tho' leaſt Weighty. And yet one would think, that it were impoſſible, but that rational Creatures ſhould ſee the plain Nullity of the former, and the moſt abundant Sufficiency of the latter.

But to return to my buſineſs: Dr. *T.* ſays in the latter end of his *17th.* Page, That *Mr.* M. *took Pen, and Dr.* T. *delivering him the Paper he had ſigned in order to a regular proceeding, he began to Write the firſt words of theſe Queſtions*; Whether God Almighty has left us any Guide, *&c.*

The truth of the matter of Fact is this, Dr. *Teniſon* having after much time ſpent in vain (if that may be ſaid to be ſo which was *ſpent* as was moſt for the Doctors purpoſe) drawn Mr. *P.* from that point which he had deſigned for the ſubject of the whole Conference, *viz. The Rule*

of Faith, and fallen into particular matters, where there is much more Sea-room for Controverſie, and conſequently leſs danger of being run a-ground, whilſt theſe things were under debate, Mr. *P.* happening to produce ſome proofs out of the Fathers in favor of Tranſubſtantiation, and particularly quoting a paſſage out of St. *Ambroſe de Sacramentis* for one, The Doctor (to uſe his own words) *catch'd* at it, crying out, that the Book was *Spurious*, and none of St. *Ambroſe's*. And in this tranſport called for Pen, Ink and Paper. And (to ſhew what a willing Mind may do) that, which was ſo hard to come by, when the Writing of the Conference was propoſed, was brought him in a trice. He writes down his Doughty Challenge: Which was to this purpoſe, *That the Book cited by Mr.* P. *was Spurious and a late Book, and none of St.* Ambroſe's, *and that he* [*Dr.* Thomas Teniſon] *would ſhew it to be ſuch.* This he valiantly ſubſcribed. Now, indeed, according to due Form Mr. *P.* ſhould have underwritten, *That he would not fail to meet this bold Challenger, deſiring only a fair Stage, and of him no favor.* But this, it ſeems, he refuſed for thoſe reaſons which he has already * Publiſhed.

* *See Mr.* P's *Account*, p. 10. *and ſequ.*

Now all this was done with ſo much noiſe and Triumph on the Doctors part, and with ſuch Tumultuous applauſe of his Adherents, that (being over and above called upon by them with great importunity) I thought it convenient to put my ſelf into the midſt of the Buſtle, that I might come to know the matter, and keep the Peace if it ſhould lie in my Power.

As ſoon as I underſtood what had been the cauſe of ſo much Tumult, I immediately applyed my

my ſelf to the Doctor (who had made ſome kind of Appeal to me) and told him, *That indeed I could not but look on it as a very diſingenuous proceeding, that he ſhould importune Mr. P. to Subſcribe to One ſingle Quotation, as if that had been the Only thing that in ſo many hours he had been able to produce for the defence of his Religion: Which would have appeared very Ridiculous (whether the Book could be proved Authentic, or not) to any Wiſe Man of either Church.* I added, *That the Doctor ſhould permit Mr. P. to do what he had deſired*, viz. *Write down all his Quotations and Arguments and Sign to them (which would look like* ſomething) *and that then the Doctor ſhould do his Beſt. And*, laſtly, *that this was no more, than what was Fair and Reaſonable.* The Doctor having little regard to what was ſaid either by Mr. *P.* or my ſelf, ſtill preſſed Mr. *P.* to ſubſcribe.

But Mr. *P.* not being drawn by the Doctors repeated inſtances, nor by the *Importunity of his* * *Ingenious Women*, to what he judged neither Prudent nor Equitable, I took the Pen into my hand, and taking the Paper from Dr. *Temſon*'s, I told him, that I would Write ſomething, which ſhould look more like the ſubſtance of the Conference, than what he had Written, and in it ſelf be more Efficacious towards the ending of the Controverſie. What I would have ſet down, was as follows.

* Pag. 70. *and in Mr.* P's *Acc.* pa. 11.

Whether God Almighty hath left us any Guide or Guides to direct us in the Interpretation of Scripture in things neceſſary to Salvation? [Or]

Whether he hath left every one to his own Underſtanding in ſuch Interpretation, without obliging

him to ſubmit his Judgment *to any other?*

But I had ſcarce Written the three firſt Words of theſe Queſtions, before the Doctor ſnatches away the Paper, and blots out my Writing (as much as he could) with his Fingers. Which was, as I ſuppoſe, leſt * *ſome weight might be laid upon Ones Writing and Signing, and the others Refuſing.* For this * was to be the Sign of Dr. *Teniſons* carrying the day. And if I had Written, and the Doctor had refuſed to Sign (as it was Ten to one but he would) all had been ſpoiled, and the buſineſs had been but a drawn Battel at beſt.

* Pag. 70.

* Viz. *Dr.* T's *Writing and Signing, and Mr.* P's *Refuſing to Sign.*

Now I muſt confeſs, that there was no great *weight*, to be laid upon my *three Words*, eſpecially after the Doctor had blotted them. But certainly the Doctors *not giving leave to Write* will bear as much *Weight*, as Mr. *P's refuſing to Sign.*

But Dr. *T.* ſaid, that *I was drawing them away from their Point.* I know not how far it drew them from their Point: But I am ſure it drew them back to that *Point* which was propoſed for the Subject of their Conference, and which they ought to have been upon, *viz. The Rule of Faith*: And which, had it been once fixt, would have ſettled even that Point which they had then rambled to. Wherefore (as I have ſaid already) I told the Doctor that I would propoſe ſomewhat, that might be look'd on as the ſubſtance of the Conference with more juſtice, than what he had Written. And as he had taken the liberty to pick out of this Conference what pleaſed him beſt for *Writing*, ſo he ought to have permitted us to make choice of that which we had a mind to, for the like purpoſe. Eſpecially when in Truth the

Queſtion

Queſtion which Mr. *P.* had propoſed and Mine were of the ſame nature, and the Doctor by Anſwering, One would have Anſwered Both; Or, indeed when my Queſtion was but the ſecond Branch of Mr. *P's.* Mr. *P.* ask'd from whom we were to receive the Scriptures. My Queſtion was from whom we were to have the Meaning of them. Now St. *Auguſtin* will tell you, that you ought to receive the Senſe or meaning of the Scripture from thoſe, on whoſe Teſtimony you admit the Letter [according to a * paſſage which I formerly Quoted to Dr. *St*---. And which he (not liking, as I ſuppoſe, St. *Auguſtins* Judgment) took no notice of.] Wherefore, (according to the Senſe of this Father) if Dr. *Teniſon* had found out thoſe Chriſtians, on whom he might have relyed for the receiving of the Scriptures, which was Mr. *P's.* Queſtion; he would have known whom to have truſted for the underſtanding them, which was Mine.

* *Aug.* contra Epiſt. Fundam.

Which being ſo, I leave my Readers to Judge, whether either of theſe Queſtions were not much more to the purpoſe, than that which the Dr. ſet up.

Indeed, it was ſo little to our Controverſie, whether that Book were truly St. *Ambroſe's* or not, that I wonder, that a grave Man ſhould forget himſelf ſo much, as to lay any ſtreſs on it, when other Proofs were offered full as plain, and out of Writers of as great Authority as St. *Ambroſe*, and even, when there is a paſſage to the ſame purpoſe, and (to a great degree) in the ſame words, in an undoubted Work of St. *Ambroſe*. Nay, one of the Arguments which is brought againſt the Authority of this Book *De Sacramentis*, is that the words

words of this Quotation are in another Work of the ſame St. *Ambroſe*, and that it is improbable, this Author would uſe the ſame Words and Phraſes in two diſtinct Books. Which, if a good Argument againſt the Authority of that Book, is likewiſe a very good one for the Authority of the Paſſage. Wherefore if that paſſage which was alledged, or one Equivalent to it were undoubtedly St. *Ambroſe*'s, of what moment could it be, whether that particular Book which was firſt named, were St. *Ambroſe*'s or not? If the paſſage prove what it was produced for, it is (at leaſt Equivalently) in an undoubted work of St. *Ambroſe*: And if it prove nothing, why ſo much clutter, whether the Book be Authentic or not?

Here the Reader may be put in mind of another Method, which the Proteſtants uſe in their Diſputations. When the Work of any Father is Quoted by Catholics, if it were ever doubted of, there is no remedy but it muſt paſs for Spurious. And when it ſhall happen to be Undoubted, they will do as much as in them lies to render it Dubious, *at leaſt* in thoſe places which are Quoted. But when nothing of this will do, their laſt ſhift is *Interpretation*, which, indeed, does their buſineſs effectually.

This *Interpretation* is laid up like a Treaſure, which is never to be brought forth but in caſes of urgent neceſſity. Otherwiſe they would need no other Fond for the carrying on of almoſt all their Controverſial Expeditions. For, what need is there, that they ſhould ſpoil their Eyes with poring on old Worm-eaten Manuſcripts, for the diſproof of an Author, when perhaps the paſſage which

which they would evade, is not half so plain against them, as that of some unquestioned Book, which already they have set aside by their *Interpretation?* What Obligation is there, that Words in a Spurious Work should have quite another Sense, than the self-same words in one which is Legitimate? No, but this knack of *Interpreting* is too great a cheat to be often Practised, and therefore, when any thing else will serve the turn, this must not appear.

I said, that Interpretation was their last shift. But (unless this be understood with some restriction) I think, I was too hasty in my Reckoning. Their *shifts* are like the Priviledges of some Parliaments not so easie to be numbred. For sometimes when the Author is unquestioned, the passage too palpably plain to be wrested, and the Party somewhat more indifferent, and not so greedy of being impos'd on, and when, for these reasons, the *Gordian knot* cannot be untyed, what should they do but follow *Alexanders* example? They lop off a Century or two out of the Five Hundred Years which their Brethren are wont to Appeal to; and it is great odds, but the Father, that is Quoted (most of them, and those the most Celebrated being in the fourth and fifth Centuries) drops with them, and loses his Authority, not out of any particular picque that they have against this Father whoever he be, but because he lived in ill times, and when Popish Errors began to be predominant. But if it shall so happen, that they do not see him lying on the ground, together with these Two Hundred Years, the third Century is sure to follow, and then it is a Thou-

sand

ſand to one but they have him down. However, if after all this he ſhall yet remain untoucht: Perhaps another Branch may fall (for theſe Errors were very *early* in the Church) or elſe the Fathers are *ſicut cæteri Homines*, and (as Dr. *T.* intimates, *p.* 16.) there is no Deciſive Determination to be built on what they ſay. *This* you will ſay, as I have ſaid * before, *agrees not well with an Appeal to the firſt Five Hundred Years.* However, this *gradual* Proceeding argues great Moderation (a thing that is ſometimes bragg'd of) and ſhews, that the Members of this Church are not for carrying matters to Extremities, but where Neceſſity (which hath no Law) obliges them.

* *See above* pa. 27.

I intimated above, that it was ten to one, but Dr. *Teniſon* would have refuſed to Write or Sign any Anſwer to my Queſtions. Which was no groundleſs Conjecture of my own. For, had he not differed from himſelf he would moſt certainly have done ſo. A Gentleman of my acquaintance (then a Proteſtant) had formerly carried him theſe Queſtions, and deſir'd his Anſwer to them in Writing. In the firſt place the Doctor took a very ſufficient time for conſideration. And in the ſecond, he abſolutely refuſed to give any thing under his hand, ſaying in excuſe, that *he knew not what Inference might be made.* Whereupon (I remember) I adviſed the Gentleman to put him in mind at their next meeting of the Logical Maxim, *A* veris *poſſunt nil niſi* vera *ſequi*, telling him (conſequently) that if his Anſwer were true, he need not fear, that any thing ſhould follow from it but Truth.

In the mean time I am not ignorant, that there

is

is ſomething in the Doctors Narrative, which is a kind of * Anſwer to my Queſtions. But (as the Reader will perceive) it is not offered by the Doctor as his Anſwer to them, neither is there any thing elſe ſet forth as ſuch throughout his whole Pamplet, ſave only the mention of two Books, *pag.* 56. and a little one (which perhaps might be one of them) that Mrs. *V.* had from him, *pag.* 24. I ſay, there is nothing elſe but theſe Books which is propoſed by Dr. *T.* as an Anſwer to thoſe Queſtions. * Pag. 18.

Now, for my own part, I muſt confeſs, that oftentimes, I think it much eaſier to return a Book to a Queſtion, than an Anſwer. My meaning is, that when a Difficulty pinches, it is much *eaſier* by long and Crafty Circumlocutions to Deceive, than by a ſhort and plain Anſwer to Satisfie. The firſt may be done by Books; but it is only Brevity and Plainneſs which can appear well in a Perſonal Conference. Wherefore, to appeal from ſuch a Conference to Books is moſt commonly to *love Darkneſs rather than Light*, and by entring into a Labyrinth of Words, rather to loſe an Objection, than to ſolve it.

It hath happened to me ſeveral times, that when I have offered any Difficult Point to ſome Diſputants, they have told me for Anſwer, *That the matter was handled in ſuch a Book, and that there I ſhould find my ſatisfaction.* I have replyed, that the Difficulty lay within a narrow Compaſs, that the Solution needed not to be very long, that therefore I deſired, they would tell me, what the Book ſaid of it. All the Anſwer I could have, was *That they had forgotten the Particulars; that the*

Book satisfied them, when they Read; and they supposed that it would have the same effect on me. Which I have taken for an evident Sign, that they had been Deluded, and not Instructed by their Author. Since had they met with a concise and solid proof, instead of a protracted and noisie Fallacy, it would have been hardly possible for them not to have born it away, especially when they had neither ill Wits, nor ill Memories.

Wherefore, I take leave to dissent from the Doctor, where he looks on it, as a piece of * *ill breeding*, to ask Questions in a Conference, which [as he thinks] are already Answered in Books. Since, there being scarce any Point which is not spoken to in Books, a Conference for the most part is nothing else, but a tryal (as far as it may be) whether the Books have said right or not: Wherefore to refer us to *them* for * Answers, is to send us thither, from whence we have Appealed. And could the *Titles of Books* pass for *Arguments* in these Conferences, a Booksellers Apprentice would out-*argue* Dr. *Tenison*, unless it be, that the late care he hath had of a *Library* may have greatly qualified him for this kind of Disputation.

On the other side, it is a shrew'd Argument with me, that this Doctor was somewhat Conscious of the Truth, of what I have said here, touching that room which there is for Fallacies in Books of Controversie, since notwithstanding he was so well prepared for the Answering my Questions, that he had * Written on the same Subject, and since he *catch'd* at all occasions of shewing his Superiority over us, he yet boggled so much

to

* Pag. 56.

* Pag. 56.

* *Certainly that Cause which the Dr. referred to 10000 pounds worth of Books was as safe, as the Felon would have been, had his request been granted of being tryed by the 12 Apostles.*

to give us his Answer upon the place; and in conclusion chose rather to turn us over to a Book. Which in the Doctors Judgment must stop every ones mouth who doth not think it worth his while to Answer it in Print. And yet the Doctor ought to be mindful of his own proceeding, so far as to give us leave to be silent, where we think an Answer a * *Condescention to an Impertinence.* But, *it is not the Doctors way*, to reflect, so much as this comes to, on what he doth himself. For had it been so, it is probable, he would not have laid any Weight on Mr. P's. Refusing to Sign his Paper (a thing unreasonable it self) when he considered, not only, that at this very time he hindred us from Writing, as hath been shewn, but also that at the beginning of the Conference he made a most frivolous excuse from Having the *whole* Written. Which Refusal, if compared with Mr. P's. was at least a Mill-Stone to a Feather. Were it easie for us to see our own faults, one would think, that here were a *Speculum* that would help the Doctor to such a sight. However, in our present case, I am affraid, he is not so defective in his own sight, as he is careful to provide dust for the Eyes of others.

* Pa. 14. *and* 15.

This Storm about the Quotation out of St. *Ambrose* lasted a great while, and with so much Commotion, that I will not undertake to describe it. Amongst the rest of the noise, the Doctor cryed often, that Mr. *P.* had *Falsified* and was a *Falsifier*. Whereupon I ventured to tell him, *that* really, *he was too severe in his Censures*: For tho' it should happen, that the Book Cited by Mr. *P.*

could not be proved to be St. *Ambroſe*'s, yet he knew well enough, that it had been always Publiſhed under his Name, and ranked among his Works. Which circumſtances might lead a Man into this Error without the Guilt of being a Falſifier. Dr. *Teniſon* ſeem'd to yield to this, and to be willing to compound the buſineſs, and reſt ſatisfied, ſo that, at leaſt Mr. *P.* might paſs for an Ignorant Perſon. The Cauſe now being quite out of Doors, and the Diſpute (as the Doctor had managed the matter) growing meerly perſonal, and, conſequently, nothing to our purpoſe.

The Doctors new terms of Reconciliation ſeemed yet too hard: For why ſhould Mr. *P.* be reputed Ignorant for Quoting an Author, which had been doubted of, unleſs he were convinced of the reaſonableneſs of that doubt by thoſe Arguments which were offer'd for it; which he was not, nor (poſſibly) ought to be? Tho' on the other ſide (as hath been intimated) it would have been an imprudence in him to have Sign'd this ſingle Quotation, as if he had nothing elſe to produce on the behalf of his Cauſe, eſpecially when we have to deal with Men whoſe Intereſt, Prejudice or Paſſion ſtrongly inclines them to *Believe* againſt us. And *facilè credunt, quod volunt.* But I was ſo far from having an opportunity of urging this latter part of my Mediation, that I ought to be very thankful for the room, I had, of reſcuing Mr. *P.* from the Doctors firſt Imputation of a *Falſifier.* Such a Permiſſion of ſpeech being (as I muſt aſſure you) a very great favor at our Conference.

Dr. *Teniſon* in his 18*th.* Page ſays, *Mr.* M. *and*

Dr.

Dr. T. *talk'd a little while about a Guide in Controverſie.* It was, indeed, a *little while.* For, notwithſtanding towards the latter end of the Conference I attempted three or four times to have ſpoken ſomething on that ſubject (which I look'd upon as the moſt important one, or rather, as I have ſaid, the only one of all Controverſie:) all my endeavors were defeated, the Doctor ſtill, by turning off the Diſcourſe, either not Anſwering to my Queſtions, as not ſuffering me to Reply to his Anſwer, Excepting only ſome few Words, which for haſte, I was forced (as the Doctor well expreſſes it) to *mutter* out when I took my leave.

Now ſince, Dr. *T.* ſets down, what he told me *in ſhort*, concerning a Guide in Controverſie, viz. *That a Man after uſing all Chriſtian means, and* Pag. 18. *the help of all Miniſterial Guides poſſible, muſt at laſt judge for himſelf, and that this was not to run on his own head: As alſo, that their People, could know the Voice of their Church, it being in their own Language, but not ſo readily the Voice of the Church of* Rome, *it being in an unknown Tongue; for the true Interpretation of which, the unlearned depend upon the particular Prieſt, that inſtructed them.* I ſay, ſince the Doctor Publiſhes what he ſaid to me on this ſubject he ought to have added what I replyed to him, tho' likewiſe it were but very ſhort for the Reaſons already given. My Talk was to this purpoſe, *viz.* That if Men, after the uſe of thoſe *Chriſtian means, and Miniſterial Guides* he ſpoke of, were by Gods appointment to follow their own Underſtandings, Thoſe Laws muſt needs be unjuſt, which puniſhed them for doing ſo. And conſequent-

ſequently what could the Engliſh *Penal Laws* have to ſay for themſelves, which did not enquire whether Men had uſed *Chriſtian Means*, and *Miniſterial Guides*, or not, but puniſhed them for following their own Underſtandings, altho' they ſhould have uſed ever ſo many *Chriſtian means*, &c. before-hand? Neither do Men ſuffer by theſe Laws, only for Doctrins relating to the Civil Government (as perhaps the Doctor would inſinuate by what * follows) but for Points meerly Religious, ſuch as are *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *not going to a Proteſtant Church*, &c. For all which Points they are puniſhed; and this (to make the caſe yet harder) by ſuch Men, as owning themſelves Fallible, muſt likewiſe own, that thoſe Opinions for which they puniſh, may be Truths, and Thoſe, which they would compel us to embrace, Errors, for ought they know.

* Pag. 24.

This Subject is ſo plain and obvious in it's own Nature, and there hath been ſo much ſaid on it already, that I ſhall only add one word by way of of a Recapitulation, which is, That on the one ſide we have the Church of *England* Teaching us *to Judge for our ſelves in Religious Matters*, and on the other *Hanging us for following her Doctrin*. If we are to be our own Judges, why are we Condemn'd for it? And if not, why are we Taught to be ſo? Moſt Religions have their Myſteries, and therefore this may be allowed to the Proteſtants. But for my part, I can ſooner admit, *that God is able to do more than I am able to underſtand*, in the Belief of Tranſubſtantiation, than that Men can at once have a juſt ground for the *Approbation* and *Condemnation* of the ſelf-ſame Proceeding. It being

easier to dis-believe our Senses when our Creator Commands, than to forego our Reason, when we have no higher Motive for it, than the Will of our Fellow-Creatures.

I must confess, that my Discourse on this Subject at the Conference, was not so large, as it is here, by reason of the shortness of those Interlocutory spaces that were allowed us by the Doctor, which seemed to be designed by him, not so much for our Speaking, as for his own Breathing, so that I was forced to cramp what I had to say into a few concise and general Propositions, and to throw them out, before the Doctor was aware of them. Viz. *That in case we were not bound by Almighty God to submit our Judgment to any* others, *but (presupposing the use of the Doctors* Christian means*) were left to the* Guidance *of our own* Understanding, *in matters of Faith; we ought not to be hindred from, or (which is the same thing) punished for Taking it for* our Guide *in such matters. That the* Penal Laws *Punished us for so doing, and therefore were unjust*: And the like. Which Propositions, tho' too brief perhaps for their being thoroughly Comprehended by the Rabble of our Hearers, were yet sufficient to let the Doctor know what I meant, and consequently for a larger Account of them, than what we have from him, *pa.* 24. Viz. *Mr.* M. *took leave, and just at the Door Muttered something about* Penal Laws. In which (as the Reader will have found) there is no Information either of the nature, or of the occasion of that Discourse: The matter being so obscurely expres'd, that a Protestant Gentleman of my acquaintance was so far deceived by the Doctors

Terms,

Terms, that he imagined, that *I had risen up in a heat, and threatned something as I went away.* And therefore for the future, when Dr. *Tenison* shall tell us, That he thinks it will *give the greater satisfaction to tell the whole Truth,*——That *Truth is best Painted at full length,*——and that *he will let the World know, the whole Truth, so far as his Memory with all due helps will serve him,* as he doth, *pag.* 45. 46, *and* 50. We will be so civil to him, as not to understand him in a Literal Sense.

Dr. *T.* says in the place above cited, that we are to have *the help of all Ministerial Guides possible,* before we *must* Judge for our selves. Now, I suppose, that by *all Ministerial Guides possible*, the Doctor does not mean, all sorts of Guides *True* or *False*. *First*, Because the *Penal Laws* hinder us from conversing with those of other Communions. And, *Secondly*, Because our Saviour himself Commands us to * *beware of false Prophets.* Wherefore I would fain know, what mark the Doctor hath to distinguish such Ministerial Guides as may be Addressed to, from such as may not. If he say, that we shall know these Guides by *the purity of their Doctrin*, [the only Mark commonly assigned by Protestants, as was intimated above, for That of the True Church.] Then it must follow, that I must first Judge what Doctrin is Pure, before I can know what Guides to have recourse to, and consequently I must Judge for my self [in the particular * Doctrins of Christianity] before I use the help of these Ministerial Guides. Which according to the Doctor is not to be done. The Circle in other Terms, and more con-

* Matth. c. 7. v. 15.

* Viz. *In the Interpretation of the Scripture.*

concisely is thus: We cannot know what Doctrin is Pure without Guides: And we cannot know what Guides to consult without first knowing what Doctrin is Pure. If he shall Name Succession, Universality, or any thing else for the mark of these *Guides*, then we will consider, whether That which is assigned, belong to the Church of *England*, or not.

The Doctor seems to say in the close of his * Answer (which as the Reader will perceive was nothing less than one of his usual Digressions from the Point in hand) *That their People knew the Voice of their Church, and needed not to depend upon the Learning of any Particular Priest for it.* If so: How could the Doctor blame this Apprentice (as he doth in his 55*th.* Page,) for not coming to him with his doubts? Would he have him repair to a *particular Priest* for Instruction, whilest he Heard and Knew the voice of their Church, and therefore (according to the Doctors own assertion) needed it not? * Pag. 18.

But, perhaps, the Doctor will say, that for the Verbal Translation of the Scripture the Protestants are not necessitated to have recourse to particular Men, the Bible being Translated to their hands, and warranted by public Authority (tho' here too they will be at a loss, unless it appear to them, that they may confide in this *Authority*) but for the Sense in all dubious places they ought to Address themselves to their Ministers. They may do it if they please: And if not (I suppose) they may let it alone, and this last, with most safety: For, according to our late Divines, *all things necessary*

to Salvation are plain in Scripture, and therefore to look after the meaning of *dubious places* is to do more, than of bounden Duty is required, and has the appearance of *a Work of Supererogation*, which is such an abominable thing with the Church of *England*, that they have a whole * Article against it, and declare that it cannot be taught without Arrogancy and Impiety, much less (as I suppose) PRACTISED. Wherefore as yet, there appears no cause, why the Apprentice should be chidden for not having waited on Dr. *T.* in this occasion. And indeed, if that be the case, *viz.* That the Members of the Church of *England* are to go to their Ministers for the Construction of these *dubious places*, I do not perceive, that they have any great advantage over those of the Church of *Rome*, tho' what the Doctor says were true, viz. *That Roman Catholics were to apply themselves to particular Priests for the Translation of the Scriptures*, since the Protestants themselves must make the same application for the Sense and Meaning of these Scriptures. And this *Sense* is that which is of the greatest importance, or rather That which is of any Importance at all.

* See 14th. Article.

But in Truth they are not particular Priests which Catholics depend on for either the Translation or Sense of the Scripture in any necessary Point of Faith, but it is on their Church, whose Voice is as Intelligible *at least*, and (with the Doctors leave) much farther Heard than that of the Church of *England*. For is it not full as evident in *England*, and much more *evident* in other Parts of the World, that the Church of *Rome Teaches a Purgatory*, than it is, that the Church of *England*

Teaches

Teaches the contrary? And ſo of other Doctrins.

This is an Age, wherein Men, whileſt they Scepticize on evident Truths, are Poſitive in Abſurdities, and therefore there want not Thoſe, who ask, *how the Members of the Church of* Rome *can know what their Church holds*. But when they ſhall have conſidered, how they themſelves come to know what That Church holds, whileſt they Condemn it's Doctrins, as alſo how a Man may come to underſtand what is held by the Church of *England*, they will not (I ſuppoſe) expect any farther Anſwer. This were it not ſo Common (and even with Men of no *Common* Wit,) would have been too frivolous, to have been taken notice of.

One endeavor which I uſed for the ſpeaking ſomewhat of a *Guide in Controverſie*, was on the following occaſion. Dr. *T.* having called me to him, and deſiring (as he ſaid) that * Mr. *P. would ſtick to ſomething*, took upon him to explain a Text of Scripture, which had been long before Cited by Mr. *P.* for the Authority of the Church, *viz.* That of St. *Matthew*, *c.* 18. *v.* 17. *If he will not hear the Church let him be to thee as an Heathen and a Publican.* The Doctor ſaid, that conſidering the Antecedent Verſes, this ought to be underſtood of ordinary Treſpaſſes, ſuch as *the not paying of a juſt debt*, *&c.* And not of Articles of Faith, making uſe of a tedious Inſtance to that purpoſe, the ſumm whereof was * *that in caſe a Man ſhould refuſe to pay his debts after one or two demands, he is put into the Eccleſiaſtical Courts (ſuppoſing it proper for their cogniſance:)*

* Pag. 21.

* Ibid.

niſance:) And if he will not ſtand to their Sentence, then he is Excommunicated, and Treated as ſuch a One. Whereupon I told the Doctor, that for my own part, I underſtood that Text of Scripture quite otherwiſe than he did, being perſuaded that we were obliged by it to Hear the Church in all thoſe things, wherein the ſame Church doth declare, that ſhe hath Power to Judge. And moſt eſpecially in matters of Faith: Which in their own Nature ſeem more proper for the *Cogniſance of Eccleſiaſtical Courts* than a Queſtion of Debt. That it was not unuſual for our Bleſſed Saviour on a particular occaſion to deliver a general Precept; as for inſtance, when the Jews ask'd him whether or no it were lawful to pay Tribute to *Cæſar*, he * called for the *Tribute-mony*, and ask'd whoſe Image it bore; and being Anſwered that it was *Cæſars*; he gave this Rule, *Render* therefore *unto* Cæſar *the things which are* Cæſars. Which Rule, I ſuppoſe, is general, and hath regard not only to *Tribute*, but alſo to whatever elſe is due from Subjects to Sovereign Princes, as *Reſpect*, *Obedience*, and the like; tho' the occaſion on which the Rule was made, and that which immediately preceded it, ſeem to be Particular, and to look no farther than his Pecuniary Rights. That in like manner, tho' this Text, *viz. If he will not hear the Church, &c.* might be ſpoken in a Particular occaſion, it could not be thence inferr'd, that it was not of a more large Extenſion, eſpecially if we ſhould compare it with other Texts, ſuch as are, * *As my Father ſent me, ſo I ſend you.* * *Go and Teach all Nations ..... and lo I am with you always even unto the end of the World.*

* Mat. c. 22. v. 19, &c.

* Joh. c. 20. v. 21.

* Matth. c. 28. v. 19, 20.

He

(a) *He that Heareth You, Heareth ME*, &c. (b) *And he gave ſome Apoſtles: and ſome Prophets: and ſome Evangeliſts: and ſome Paſtors and Teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Miniſtry*, &c. *That we henceforth be no more Children, (c) toſſed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrin*, &c. (d) *Obey thoſe that are ſet over you, ---- for they watch as being to render account for your Souls.* All which places (at leaſt, according to my own Judgment) are clear for that Perpetuity, and that Authority of the Church, which are believed by Roman Catholics.

(a) Luke c. 10. v. 16.
(b) Eph. c. 4. v. 11, &c.
(c) *If Paſtors are left to keep us from being toſſed to and fro, it follows that we muſt hearken to them, as alſo that they muſt be kept from being toſſed to and fro themſelves. Otherwiſe they will not be able to effect that for which they were left.*
(d) Hebr. c. 13. v. 17.

But above all, this Truth ſeems to be moſt apparent to me, when I conſider what immediately follows in this place of Scripture, *viz.* When our Saviour had ſaid, *If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen, and a Publican*, which is the ſubject of our preſent Controverſie, He adds in the very next Verſe [ſpeaking to his Church] *Verily, I ſay unto you*, whatſoever *you ſhall Bind on Earth, ſhall be Bound in Heaven*, &c. * This Term WHATSOEVER, whether it regard the *Perſons*, or the *Things* which fall under the Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure, or elſe *Both*, is of a moſt general Signification: So that it is evident, that the Power given in this place hath no other Reſtriction, or Limit, but the Will and Determination of thoſe to whom it is given, there being nothing more required for the *Binding*, or *Looſing* a Thing in Heaven, than that the Church ſhould determin to *Bind*, or *Looſe* it on

* *The Doctor ought to have conſidered what came after his Text, as well as what went before, tho one having as manifeſt a regard to it as the other.*

on Earth. Which proves what I asserted above, *viz.* That the Church hath Power to Judge in all those things, wherein she Declares Her self to have it. [It is true however, that being always Guided by the same Holy Spirit, which invests her with this Authority, she can never Declare Her self to be our Judge, but where she ought, and where it is highly for our Advantage, that she should be so.]

My Discourse on this occasion was to this effect, but (as I have said of those on other subjects) much shorter, tho' this was the fairest opportunity of speaking that Dr. *Tenison* allowed me, during the whole Conference. In Conclusion, I assured the Doctor, that I was wholly convinced that the abovementioned Text (as I declared before) had quite another meaning, than what he gave of it. And therefore I ask'd him, whether, being so convinced as I was, I ought to follow his Interpretation or my own. He Answered, that he would appeal to the Company, whether the Sence, which he gave of the place, were not * plainly so. I told him that this would not serve my turn, for tho' that Company should happen to be all of his Mind (as they were not, there being some amongst them of my own Judgment) yet so long as my opinion continued as it was, I should be still at the same loss, unless the Doctor could inform me, whose Judgment I was to trust, my Own, or Theirs. The Doctor said, that for the right Interpretation of Scripture, I ought to examin the Originals, consult Learned Men * *&c.* Whereas, said he, *this Boy did none of these things: he came not to Me, nor to his Master, &c.* and so striking

* *Had it been plain it would not have stood in need of his explanation.*

* *Why so much ado for what he said was plain? Had the Company, he appealed to, done all this?*

ſtriking out of the Road, with a Cavil about the Boy, I could never get him into it again.

Had I been able to have held him to the Point a little longer, he muſt have granted me according to his own principle of *Every ones Power of Judging for himſelf*, That ſeeing I Judged the Senſe of Holy Scripture to be Different from what he thought, I was as much bound to *diſ-believe* his Doctrin, as he was to *believe* it. Which would have been an excellent inſtance, how much Dr. *Teniſon*'s *Rule* of Faith tended to the *Unity* of it; And undoubtedly muſt have ſounded very ſtrangely in the Ears of his Pariſhioners, notwithſtanding their great eſteem and affection for him. Which I queſtion not, but the Doctor was well aware of, and therefore thought it more to his purpoſe, to chide the Boy for *not having waſh'd his Face* (as the Story goes of ſuch another *Anſwerer*) than to ſuffer the Diſputation to proceed. And yet this is the Doctor, who in this very place deſires, that his Adverſary would * *ſtick to ſomething*. But *non videmus id Mantica, quod à tergo eſt.* * Pag. 21.

I have already taken notice of a Sentence or two, which the Doctor ſets to my account, more than I can remember my ſelf to have been guilty of. There is another of them *pa.* 21. viz. *Mr. M. asked Dr. T. if he could tell Chapter and Verſe throughout the Bible.* And I think there are one or two more of the like nature: But they are of ſo little importance one way or other; that (tho' I believe they were never ſpoken by me, yet) they ſhall be *ſaid*, or *not ſaid*, as the Doctor pleaſes. But touching what he ſays, *pa.* 18. Of ſomething

ſpoken

ſpoken to me about the Conference betwixt ſome Gentlemen of the Church of *Rome*, and Dr. *Stillingfleet* and Dr. *Burnet*, I remember nothing of it. Neither had I any concern in that Conference, or in any thing relating to it.

In the Doctors 22*d.* and 23*d.* Pages, the Reader will find the following Lines. —— *After this Dr.* T. *ſaid to Mr.* P. *there was one thing remaining and fit to be ſaid to him: He had in a Printed Paper promiſed not to tamper about Religion with the Proteſtant Boys who ſhould come to the* Savoy-*School; it had appeared, that he tampered with Boys out of his care, and would do ſo much more with thoſe under it: he ſaid it did not follow, becauſe of his word which he would not break, and that for this Boy he had done it in order to his everlaſting Salvation. Dr.* T. *anſwered, that being your Principle, that all out of your Communion are Damned, you being a Jeſuit and a Papiſt, muſt break your word in that Paper for the neceſſary good (as you think) of the Souls of the Boys, eſpecially you having hope of turning Boys under your care. Mr.* M. *ſaid to Dr.* T. *This reflects upon the King. Another more loud, this reflects upon the King, and ſuggeſts, that he will break his word: And Mr.* P. *joyned in the Accuſation, but many of the Hearers cryed out againſt them, and ſaid it was a Knaviſh trick. Mr.* M. *was going away, Dr.* T. *called to him, and deſired him not to run away with a falſe Tale. Mr.* M. *denyed he ſaid ſuch words, Dr.* T. *told him he did, and that for his part he thought his Loyalty at this time to be more valuable than Mr.* M's. *Becauſe he as a Son of the Church of* England, *profeſſed he would not Rebell againſt the King, not-*

with-

withstanding he might be of another Religion, whereas Mr. M. *being of the same Religion, could not so well separate Loyalty from Interest. Dr.* T. *being concerned at this false and unworthy way of catching Men, did say, to Mr.* M. *at the Door of the first Room, that if he had persisted in this Trick, he could not have forborn to have given him the Name of Evidence* Meredith.

Here it is, that the Doctor Storms indeed! Here it is, that his Rage breaks forth!--- *Hunc tu, Romane, Caveto!* Here it is, that he manifests the Truth of what he tells us in his Epistle to his Parishioners, and convinces us at length, *that amidst so many things there is* somewhat *sincere*! Here it is, that the loss of his Fathers Benefice begins to work, and *raises his Suspicion and Indignation* to so high a pitch, that, as he says, *it is a difficulty to him to Temper himself!*

Out comes — A *Knavish trick* — A *False tale* — A *False and unworthy way* — *Evidence* Meredith!

What a deal of *Billings-gate* Rhetoric have we here, and all cramm'd into half a Page? Is this Dr. *Tenison* that speaks, — *Tantane animis Cœlestibus Iræ!* Is it possible for the Anger of a Reverend Divine to boyl up to so much scum? Does he who was so ready at the Conference with St. *Jude's* Reproof against Railing, so soon forget his own Instructions? When we see *Practices* so different from *Words*, can we think, that his former Reprehension, was any other, than the doing that very thing which he seemed to Reprehend?

Out of the abundance of the Heart the * *Mouth speaketh.* And where the Streams are so bitter, it * Luke c. 6. v. 45.

is not hard to guess, how much Gall there is at the Fountain. Certainly had I been as well acquainted with this Gentlemans Temper before our *Conference*, as I am by it, I should have had one single Exception against Dr. *T.* which would have put his *three Exceptions against Mr.* M. out of Countenance: I say, his *Exceptions*, not *Himself.*

But, forasmuch as Dr. *Tenison* seems to lay the blame of all his immoderate Heat on those Impressions that were made on him during his Childhood, I will not lose so excellent an Opportunity (since I design rather to Benefit others, than Right my self) of letting my Readers know the strange Force of such Impressions, and consequently the great Care which the Education of their Children exacts from them. Which (I believe) I shall do, if I let them see, that Dr. *Tenison* had not the least Glympse of Reason for all this Fury, but, that the whole (as far as we could perceive) was entirely owing to that pernicious Tincture which most unfortunately he had received, whilest he was Young, and it is probable, before he came to the Years of discretion. And I question not, but the matter of fact rightly stated, and freed from the Doctors disguises will effect This. And it is as follows,

Dr. *Tenison* spoke to this purpose, *that whereas the Jesuits had Published a Paper, in which they promise not to tamper about Religion with the Boys that come to their Schools, Mr.* P. *had meddled with one who was not his Scholar, and therefore it was probable, he would much more do so with such as were.* Mr. P. replyed, *It did not follow, he having given his*

his word for the one, but not for the other; adding, *that he neither had, nor would* break his word *in that matter*: Whereupon the Doctor said the following words, If you are a Papist you must break your word. On these words, and spoken in these Circumstances, I said —*This reflects too far* —*These things are not fit to be heard* —And then retiring a step or two, I came back to the Company again, and perceiving that no notice was taken by the Doctor of what I had said on purpose that he might forbear such Discourses as, according to my judgment, might draw after them pernicious consequences, that my Admonition might be yet plainer to him, I said —*This reflects upon the King* — which was no more than what I meant by my former words, tho' then I forbore to name the King, as well out of a respect to His Majesty, as because I had no desire, that the hint I then gave should be taken notice of, any farther than by the Doctor himself; So far was I from any intention of *catching* him, as he expresseth it; and even when I saw it necessary to speak more plainly, that what I said might have some effect, I did it in so low a voice, that I am confident the greatest part of the Company did not hear me, at least I desired they should not.

I beg of my Readers to pause here a little while, and consider, what it is, that is so heinous in all this proceeding: Let them discuss every part and parcel of it as rigorously as they please, and then tell me, whether or no they can discover any other *Motive*, the Doctor had to his *severe Lan-*

gauge on this occasion, save only That, which (as he acquaints us in his forementioned Epistle) had lain by him for so many Years.

Can any one affirm at this time of day, that such Propositions, [viz. *Papists are Breakers of their word*, or *If you are a Papist you must break your word*] are fit to be vented, and Instilled into the Common People, and this too (that they may receive it with less hesitation) from the Mouths of those, from whom they expect nothing but Gospel? Was not the Jealousie which the Author of the late *Letter to a Dissenter* endeavored to raise, as if his Sacred Majesty would be hindred by his Religion from complying with his * promise, the most Seditious part, of that most *Seditious* Piece, and (as I may say) the *Venom* of that Viper? And had not Dr. *Tenisons* Loyalty been more *valuable* by such Expressions of his Abhorrence for that Pamplet, as the World hath received from the Tongues and Pens of many other Worthy Persons, than it can appear by seeming, at least, to joyn with the Author of it in that very Insinuation, which (above all the rest) renders him the most Detestable? And lastly was it so weighty an Offence in me, to give the Doctor a Friendly hint of the inconvenience of such Discourses, that he is not contented with those opprobrious Terms, he bestow'd on me at the Conference, and wherewith he hath since aspersed me in this Narrative, but still (as I am told he does in a later Pamphlet) heaps Abuse upon Abuse, as if I had unpardonably Injured him by suffering the worst of Injuries from him without Returning them,

* Viz. *Of Liberty of Conscience.*

or

or (hitherto) ſo much as Complaining of them? If this be the Doctors Loyalty, God grant his Majeſty better Subjects. If this be his Juſtice, God keep me from another Experiment of it. And laſtly, if this be his Morality: Will the Doctor take it ill, if we ſhould have ſo good an Opinion of thoſe Pariſhioners whom he ſo much extolls, as to hope that in his two large Pariſhes there are not Many but what are better Chriſtians than their Paſtor?

It is true, that the Experience of many Years has rendred our Prince's Juſtice and Conſtancy ſo well known to all ſorts of People, that it muſt needs be hard for ſuch Inſinuations as theſe to find place amongſt them. However, when Men have been prevailed with to believe, that Chriſt himſelf hath not made good a Promiſe of his, *viz.* That of *being with his Church to the end of the World*, ſhall we think it impoſſible, but that they may come to entertain as mean a thought as this of an Earthly Sovereign, how Great and Good ſoever he may be, eſpecially when theſe Talents which have ſucceeded ſo well in the greater undertaking, are employed for the compaſſing of the leſs? The ſame vitious Inclination to Diſobedience and miſtaken Liberty, that rendred them plyable to the firſt Impoſture, is not leſſened but increaſed by their being deceived, and therefore of Conſequence leaves them ſtill more diſpoſed for the ſecond. And certainly for theſe Reaſons, a moderate Caution, where any thing of this Danger appears, ought not to be look't on as either too Officious, or Superfluous.

Had

Had this buſineſs been fairly Repreſented, Dr. *Tenifon* himſelf had been aſhamed of letting ſo much Choler break forth, where (even according to Worldly Maxims) there was ſo little cauſe for it: And therefore if you take notice, you will find, that he has not permitted himſelf ſo far to be tranſported by his Paſſion, but that he *hath taken Wit in his Anger*, and notwithſtanding his * *abhorrence of Shifting and Inſincerity* hath (for reaſons eaſily diſcernible) related the matter of Fact quite otherwiſe than in truth it was. And therefore ſince this Gentleman in his 46*th*. Page, promiſes *a juſt Repreſentation of the whole*, we muſt from henceforward conclude, that they are not Papiſts only, who are *breakers of their Word*.

* Pag. 83.

Dr. *Tenifon* ſeems to affirm (as you will have ſeen) That it was on his ſaying to Mr. *P*. the following words [viz. *That being your principle, that all out of your Communion are damned, you being a* Jeſuit *and a* Papiſt, *muſt break your word in the Paper for the neceſſary good (as you think) of the Souls of the Boys, eſpecially you having hope of turning Boys under your care*] I ſay he ſeems to tell us, That on theſe words, Mr. *M*. ſaid to Dr. *T*. *This reflects upon the King*. Now for my own part I deſire, that my Portion in Gods favor may be no farther ſure, than this is Falſe: Which, were I not very certain of what I here relate, I would not ſay for ten thouſand Worlds. The words which I took notice of, and on which I ſpoke the forementioned Sentences, viz. *This reflects too far, &c.* were

were those which I noted above, viz. *If you are a Papist, you must break your word.* For had the Doctor spoken of this matter in the words of his present Narrative, I am well assured, that I should not have made that Reflection on it: For altho' the speech, even as himself puts it, cannot be look'd on as very seasonable in this juncture of Affairs, yet that Restriction of ——*you being a* Jesuit, (however *forced* and *improper* as may appear by what * Mr. *P.* hath said of it) would have hindred me from saying, That *it reflected on the King*, since I can assure him (over and above what I have told him already) that I was so far from seeking an occasion of speaking what I did, that I was sorry *that* which he offered for it, was so necessary to be taken: My nature (if I am not mistaken in it) being too little inclined to *Displease*, for the making such unwelcome Addresses, but where a Sense of Duty absolutely requires them.

* *See Mr. P's. Account* pag. 14. *& Sequ.*

The Sentence which I reflected on was so plainly lyable to such a Remark, that (as Dr. *Tenison* confesses) two or three immediately joyned with me in it. Nay, who can doubt, but that even the Doctor himself was of the same perswasion, when he thought it for his purpose to Change it, and that, by so considerable an Alteration, as hath been shewn, *viz.* by restraining that to Jesuits only, which (as it was spoken) extended to all Catholics?

I must confess, that this kind of Retractation (I mean, a *Disowning* of the Expression that was com-

Had this buſineſs been fairly Repreſented, Dr. *Teniſon* himſelf had been aſhamed of letting ſo much Choler break forth, where (even according to Worldly Maxims) there was ſo little cauſe for it: And therefore if you take notice, you will find, that he has not permitted himſelf ſo far to be tranſported by his Paſſion, but that he *hath taken Wit in his Anger*, and notwithſtanding his * *abhorrence of Shifting and Inſincerity* hath (for reaſons eaſily diſcernible) related the matter of Fact quite otherwiſe than in truth it was. And therefore ſince this Gentleman in his 46*th*. Page, promiſes *a juſt Repreſentation of the whole*, we muſt from henceforward conclude, that they are not Papiſts only, who are *breakers of their Word*.

* Pag. 83.

Dr. *Teniſon* ſeems to affirm (as you will have ſeen) That it was on his ſaying to Mr. *P.* the following words [viz. *That being your principle, that all out of your Communion are damned, you being a* Jeſuit *and a* Papiſt, *muſt break your word in the Paper for the neceſſary good (as you think) of the Souls of the Boys, eſpecially you having hope of turning Boys under your care*] I ſay he ſeems to tell us, That on theſe words, Mr. *M.* ſaid to Dr. *T. This reflects upon the King.* Now for my own part I deſire, that my Portion in Gods favor may be no farther ſure, than this is Falſe: Which, were I not very certain of what I here relate, I would not ſay for ten thouſand Worlds. The words which I took notice of, and on which I ſpoke the forementioned Sentences, viz. *This reflects too far, &c.* were

were those which I noted above, viz. *If you are a Papist, you must break your word.* For had the Doctor spoken of this matter in the words of his present Narrative, I am well assured, that I should not have made that Reflection on it: For altho' the speech, even as himself puts it, cannot be look'd on as very seasonable in this juncture of Affairs, yet that Restriction of ——*you being a* Jesuit, (however *forced* and *improper* as may appear by what * Mr. *P.* hath said of it) would have hindred me from saying, That *it reflected on the King*, since I can assure him (over and above what I have told him already) that I was so far from seeking an occasion of speaking what I did, that I was sorry *that* which he offered for it, was so necessary to be taken: My nature (if I am not mistaken in it) being too little inclined to *Displease*, for the making such unwelcome Addresses, but where a Sense of Duty absolutely requires them.

* *See Mr. P's. Account* pag. 14. *& Sequ.*

The Sentence which I reflected on was so plainly lyable to such a Remark, that (as Dr. *Tenison* confesses) two or three immediately joyned with me in it. Nay, who can doubt, but that even the Doctor himself was of the same perswasion, when he thought it for his purpose to Change it, and that, by so considerable an Alteration, as hath been shewn, *viz.* by restraining that to Jesuits only, which (as it was spoken) extended to all Catholics?

I must confess, that this kind of Retractation (I mean, a *Disowning* of the Expression that was com-

complained of) is a better Argument of Dr. *Tenisons* Repentance, than it would have been to have offered at it's Justification. However, the Doctor ought not to appear Vertuous at his Neighbors cost, he ought not so far to consult his own *Good Name*, as not to care what becomes of mine. Especially, when the value of Reputation is so well known to him, that he thinks it worth his while (as may be perceived by his above-cited Dedicatory Epistle) to raise the whole *posse* of two large Parishes to * preserve it.

* *But twice as much would be little enough to preserve it, should it please God, that the Truth of this very passage alone, were fully known.*

Why must I suffer, because the Doctor is ashamed of what he said? He might learn by that unwillingness which he finds in himself to own his Guilt, how grievous the Imputation of it must be to another. Certainly, had his Conscience been awake whilst he Penn'd this Account, he would have seen that the --- *Knavish Trick*, the ---*False Tale*, the --- *False and Unworthy way*, could not have been so fitly sent abroad, as kept at home, and because such *Accounts* [in the Cant of the Mobile] Denominate, as well as *Evidences* (if Dr. T's example be as good a Warrant for Ribaldry, as St. *Pauls* * was for a Grave, tho' sharp Reprehension) give me leave to say, That *Narrative-Tenison* would have been as good a Jest, and (I am sure) as the case stands, a far juster reproach than *Evidence-Meredith*. But for such *merry conceits* as these, I must confess, it is my Opinion, that both our Coats (tho' mine be not Canonical) ought to be of another Colour.

* *Mr.* P's *Account*, pag. 5.

But that, which renders my Complaint on this occasion yet more reasonable, is, that Dr. *Tenison* was

was under no preciſe neceſſity of taking ſuch a courſe as this, for the clearing of himſelf. He might have declared, that this Sentence dropt from him in the eagerneſs of Diſcourſe and at unawares. We ſhould not have been ſo ſevere to his lapſes, as he is to * ours. We do not think, that our Cauſe is ſo near *Sinking*, that we ſhould catch at ſuch Twigs to keep it above Water. He might have ſaid, that tho' his Expreſſion reach'd to all Roman Catholics, he had no intention of including more than the Jeſuits. This (in ſome meaſure at leaſt) would have ſav'd both his Credit, and mine. Nay, if he had ſo pleaſed, he might have blamed the Inference which I had drawn from his Diſcourſe, ſince I had much rather, that his Cenſure ſhould have fallen on my Judgment than on my Integrity. For I can aſſure him, that I eſteem it (whatever he may do) a leſs Inconvenience to be thought Weak in the former than Defective in the latter. Wherefore to conclude, there having been other ways of complying with that ſtrong innate principle of ſelf-preſervation, it is ſomewhat the more afflicting to me, that he ſhould pitch on no other means of wiping off his own Spots, but by Aſperſing me.

* Viz. *Miſſpellings, and the like.*

Methinks, this haſty and inconſiderate Speech (if it were ſuch) might have ſeem'd to him as fair an opportunity of asking pardon, as ſome other of his ſayings have done, ſuch as were, * *That he would not come under Mr.* P's *Ferula*, and *that Mr.* P. *might give his Papers for Kites to his Boys.* And the crying *Peccavi* in thoſe trivial occaſions, and the omitting it where his Princes honor, and his fellow-Subjects Reputation lay ſo much at ſtake,

* Pag. 13. and 17.

does it not look somewhat like *Straining at a Gnat and Swallowing a Camel?*

It is true, that immediately after the Doctor had ended his wrangling about this matter with Mr. *P.* he called after me, and (as I think) *desired me not to run away with a false Tale*, telling me, that his words were —— *You being a* Jesuit *and a* Papist, *&c.* and *that (he hoped) the King was not a* Jesuit, *and therefore that his speech could not concern him.* I replyed, in these express Terms, *Your words* [*viz.* Those which I had taken notice of] *were not* You being a Jesuit and a Papist, &c. *but* If you are a Papist, you must break your word. I said moreover, *that I had no design to Inform against him*, as some in the Crowd had mutter'd, and *that my Intention in taking notice of his words was no other, than* (what I have had occasion to intimate before) *that he might learn to be somewhat more Cautious and Deliberate in his Discourses for the future.* Now, how comes the Doctors *True Account* to be wholly silent in so material a passage? But the Causes of Complaint come so thick, that I must beg leave to forbear the making it now and then: It being hard for me to vary my phrase as often as a new Injury seems to require it.

Mr. *M.* says the Doctor, *denied he said such words, viz.* That the Doctors Proposition had reflected on the King.

The confusion was so great at this time (there being then three or four bawling about my Ears at once) that I cannot well call to mind what I said; only

only thus much I distinctly remember, *viz.* That one of the Doctors Friends affirmed again and again, *that I had not spoken those words*, whom I did not contradict, partly because I was not well assur'd whether or no I had said, what was then particularly mentioned, in such manner as to be heard by any of the Company, having (as I said before) spoken very low; and partly because I desir'd that the Doctor might receive as little dissatisfaction, as it was possible, and therefore since I understood, he knew already what fault had been found with his Proposition (which was all I aimed at) I was loath to disquiet him farther by repeating That, which, tho' reasonably enough urged, had yet been ungrateful to him. But if any word dropt from me through suddenness of Speech, that implyed such a Denyal as the Doctor mentions, it was more than I intended, and must be attributed to that distraction of mind which is hardly avoidable amidst such Peals of various Discourses, where the Attention being called upon by many Different matters at once, is sufficiently applyed to none. For as soon as the Doctor (who seemed to suspect, that I meditated on some Information against him, and therefore, not to be contented with my Silence) urged me by the continuance of his Expostulations to declare my self in more express Terms, I was far from Disowning that I had Reflected on his forementioned Proposition, as the Reader will have perceived by what he met with in my last Remark, where I repeat some part of our Discourse on this occasion, in which I acknowledged that I had Reflected on the Doctors Words, but denyed that it was with any other Design, save only, that

he himself might *Reflect* a little more on such as he should purpose to speak for the future: A Caution which (God knows) the best of us stand in need of.

But whereas some persons of that Company spoke as if I had declared, *that the Doctor had Reflected on the King*, and that on such a supposition I had an Intention of Informing against him, it is not improbable, but that this (or any thing else which I should have taken to have had this meaning) might have been flatly denyed by me. For I look'd on it as one thing, *For the Doctor to have Reflected on the King*, and another *for his Proposition to have done so*; since for the Truth of the former, it seem'd necessary to me, that the Doctor should have actually thought on the King (and Reflected on him in his mind) when he spoke those Words; which possibly he might not do. [Nay, I cannot do him so much Injury as to imagin, that he understood (I do not say, the whole extent, but even) the obvious Consequences of many of his Speeches at this Conference; since, if he had done so, I question not, but he would have omitted them.] But on the other hand, that a Proposition may be truly said *to Reflect on the King*, nothing else is required, than by a Natural and Easie Inference, It should appear to include him within its Censure. As for Example, when all Papists are said to be Breakers of their Word (since we cannot have a better instance than we have in the present Case) the King is manifestly included: Tho' perhaps the Speaker may not reflect that he is so. Wherefore I say, I might deny, that I had accused the Doctor *of Reflecting on the King*, and

yet

yet at the ſame time affirm, that his Propoſition did.

This conſideration leads me to another Remark, *which is*, that tho' every tittle of what the Doctor here relates ſhould be true (as it is not) and tho' I ſhould have had a purpoſe of Informing (as was likewiſe falſely imagined) yet the Doctor was too haſty in charging me with *running away with a falſe Tale*. For what Tale had the Doctor heard from me, that was Falſe? The Doctor had ſpoken certain words: And I affirmed that ſuch *words* Reflected on the King. Where is the Falſeneſs of this Story? Or rather, what *Story* is there in This? I ſaid not (as I told you juſt now) that the Doctor Reflected on the King, but that his *Words* Reflected on him; which tho' it had been falſe (unleſs I had ſpoken contrary to my own mind) had been the Error of Judgment, or a fault in my *Inferring Faculty*, and not a Lie, as the Doctor would have it. I preſume, that thoſe who hold *Tranſubſtantiation* and *Purgatory* will not paſs for Lyars with the Doctor, according to the propriety of our Common Speech, tho' at the ſame time he may take ſuch Tenets to be Erroneous, and the Arguments that are brought to prove them, Sophiſms. Wherefore in this Particular Caſe, altho' my Inference had been Bad, my Conſcience might have been Good, ſince it muſt needs go very hard with the World if every Man were to be as ill a Chriſtian, as he is a Logician.

All the Information (had I intended any ſuch thing) which I could, or ſhould have given in this

this matter, was, *that* Dr. *Tenison, had spoken such Words as I had heard from him, and that according to my Judgment those* Words *Reflected on the King.* But whether they did so, or not, or how far the Doctor was culpable or innocent, must have been left to others to determine. And after this if the Doctor, and his *Words* both, should have been Acquitted; it might perhaps have appeared to him how greatly it was for his advantage, that his *Words* were not left to a Private Interpretation (as he leaves God Almighties) but that proper Judges had been chosen out and Authorized for that purpose. This Reflection, I say, might Naturally enough have come into the Doctors mind. But I cannot think, that it would have appeared to those Judges (whosoever they should be) or to any other sober person, that I had been guilty of any Perjurious Testimony in this Proceeding, as the Doctors *Knavish Trick, False Tale*, and the rest of his Civil Language would imply. And this is another Reason why the Doctors *Civilities* ought not to have gone from before his own Door.

The bare *matter of Fact* in the forementioned business singly related (as I said at first) would have been sufficient, to have shewn the unreasonableness of Dr. *Tenisons* Passion; however I have added these few Remarks, that it might the more fully appear, how lasting and forcible an Influence these *Early* * *Tinctures* have upon our minds, and consequently what great Reason all Fathers of Families (as I intimated above) have to take notice of what is said by the Poet,

* Quo semel est imbuta recens, &c.

Poet, *viz. Maxima Debetur* puero *Reverentia.*

But if former Impreſſions may paſs as an excuſe for preſent Tranſports in Mortals of a *lower* ſtamp (for I take it for granted that Wiſe Men ought to be Superior to all theſe Irregular Motions, whether * Natural, or Accidental) there does not want ſomething of this kind, which it would have been in my Power alſo to have produced as *a Motive to ſevere Language*, had I been guilty of any, I mean, an *Impreſſion* made likewiſe on Me, not in my Childhood, but in my ripeſt Age; not by the behavior of one of the Doctors Brethren, real, or ſuppoſed, but by his own; not Thirty or Forty Years ſince, but no more than a few Months ago, and laſtly not unreaſonably, but with a great deal of Reaſon.

* Sapiens Dominabitur Aſtris.

To let the Reader know what I mean without farther preamble: *During the late Commiſſion for the* Licenſing of Pedlars, *a* Roman-Catholic *Addreſſed himſelf to Dr.* Tenniſon *for his* Certificate, *in order to the obtaining of one of theſe* Licenſes. *The Doctor having found out, what Religion he was of, told him, that* no Papiſt could be a good Subject, *and thereupon abſolutely* * *refuſed to do what he deſired.* Now, this Story I received from ſo good hands, that I could not queſtion the Truth of it, and therefore I may leave it to my Reader to conſider, what Impreſſion it muſt needs make on me, to ſee, not only my ſelf, but the Chriſtians of ſo many Ages and Countries traduced and blaſted all at once, and left even without ſo much Reputation as was neceſſary for a * Pedlar. It is true, I upbraided not the Doctor with this Story, at the opening of our Conference, tho' his Stories concerning

* *I am told, the Dr. ſays, that for meer* Religion *no one was ever* an hair of his head *the worſe by his means. How well theſe* Stories *agree?*

* *To make amends, the Dr. will allow me to be a* Saleſman *at an Auction of Arguments.*

cerning me might have provoked me to it, and tho' *this* alone had been worth them all: However I believe, that none will think it ſtrange if it left my mind a little more diſpoſed to take notice of what the Doctor ſaid, and not to conclude thoſe things, which otherwiſe I ſhould have reputed dangerous, to be innocent meerly becauſe they were ſpoken by him: Neither is it wonderful if the Reſentment of an Injury ſhould be ſomewhat greater where former wounds (and *deep* and *freſh* ones too) render us more ſenſible, than it would have been in another circumſtance. But enough of this: I am unwilling to *rip up* (if that term may be uſed of *ſuch* as are not yet well cloſed) even *new* ſores. Neither would I open them at preſent, did I not think it neceſſary in order to a Cure.

Could but theſe Gentlemen Examin themſelves a little, and reflect a while upon their own Proceedings, we ſhould not have ſuch hard meaſure at their hands.

* *Above* pa. 17. & ſequ.

The Reader has * ſeen how innocent my Diſcourſe was touching the *Largeneſs of the Pariſhes in the Suburbs and the neceſſity of more Churches*, and yet Dr. *Teniſon* looked on it as ſo great a Crime, that he thought me not fit to be truſted as one of the Hearers of his Conference, meerly on that account, and the beſt Name he could allow me (for the Doctor has an excellent Invention at *Calling-Names*) was that of an Intermedler.

In like manner, in my Letter to Dr. *St.* I had theſe words —— *If all places were to be avoided, wherein Lies are told I am afraid, that Dr.* St——. *would run the hazard of being ſilenced for want of a Pulpit,*

Pulpit, which might be ventur'd on. This the Doctor ſtretched to a Complement on the *London Clergy* in * General; and (to ſhew his good Nature) reſerv'd it for his own Complement to me at parting; or elſe (more properly indeed, conſidering the *Genius* of this Writer) for the *Point* of his Controverſial Epigram. The Expreſſion was uſed by me on this Occaſion: I offer'd ſomewhat in defence of ſuch as frequented Coffee-houſes; and intimated, amongſt other things of that kind, that it was no good Reaſon why thoſe Houſes ought neceſſarily to be forborn, becauſe it often happened that Seditious or Lying * Diſcourſes were vented in them; there being no places ſo Sacred, which ſuch things as theſe had not acceſs to ſome time or other; no, not the Pulpits themſelves. I conſider'd indeed, that Miſrepreſentations of late had been more frequent in Pulpits than formerly; wherefore I hinted, *it was to be feared that e'r long none of them would be left, but what would have met with ſome Miſrepreſenter or other.* I will not deny (what indeed is evident in it ſelf) that I reflected on ſome Preachers; but how this could paſs for a Complement on the whole *London* Clergy, I ſtand in need of Dr. *St.*'s Subtilty

* *See Dr. St.'s ſecond Letter to Mr. G. in the end. If he means by* London-Clergy *in this place only* ſome *of them (for I ſuſpect a Loop-hole whil'ſt I am dealing with this Gentleman) what is here ſaid will not belong to him; and then he is only to be blam'd for an* obſcure *and* enſnaring *Expreſſion.*

* *One good end for which I ſaid theſe places might be viſited, was to take ſuch Opportunities as ſhould happen for the* diverting Diſcourſes from what was Seditious, Idle, or Profane, to that which was Serious and Uſeful, either for This Life, or the Next, *&c.* This, *I ſaid*, was a Miſſionary Zeal, and therefore what the Children of the Reformation were little acquainted with. *The Doctor anſwers*, That tho' he be no Friend to Seditious, Idle, or Profane Diſcourſes, yet it looks oddly to turn Places of Diverſion into Schools of Diſputing. *He ſtill puts things upon the ſtretch, as if there were no other way of diverting thoſe Diſcourſes, but by Scholaſtic Diſputations, which were not mentioned by me. However, the Doctor muſt be our great a Friend to Seditious Diſcourſes, not to think even ſuch Diſputations much better; and therefore, at leaſt when there is no other way of putting an end to the* former, *it cannot be ill done to introduce the* latter. *But the Doctor likes not this* Miſſionary Zeal: *as if, forſooth, it were the worſe becauſe it wanted his Approbation. I queſtion not but he likes the Reformation as well, for not ſending Miſſionaries into* China, *as for not endeavouring to do good in Coffee-houſes. The Doctor may call to mind what Inſtructions were given by St.* Paul *to* Timothy, *viz. That he ſhould be zealous in his Exhortations, even to importunity, Preaching as well out of ſeaſon, as in it; and then perhaps he will not think it ſuch a mortal Offence to endeavour the reclaiming of a Soul*

from Error or Vice, wherefoever a probability of doing it, or even a poſſibility, ſhall appear, eſpecially when he conſiders that ſome men are ſuch ſtudious ſhunners of Pious Inſtructions, that unleſs they meet with them amidſt their Paſtimes, and when they leaſt think of them, they will always want them. Such is the goodneſs of our Lord, that when the Gueſts come not where they may be regularly invited, he ſends his Servants into the High-ways, &c. to call them.

But the Keepers of theſe Houſes will be Loſers by ſuch Diſputes, for men do not love to lace their Coffee with Controverſies. *Dr.* St. *knows how great an Argument Gain is with moſt men. The Author of* a Seaſonable Diſcourſe againſt Popery *did it before him, when he addreſſed two of his main* Diſſuaſives *to the Graſiers and the Lawyers, putting them in mind that if Catholic Religion ſhould be reſtored in* England, *the one would be impoveriſh'd by* Faſting-days, *and the other by* Appeals to Rome, *and ſo engaging that Paſſion* [viz. *the love of Money*] *to be of his ſide, which as a Divine he ought to have preached againſt. But no damage ought to be apprehended from that which is good. And inaſmuch as concerns Coffee-houſes, if men love not to* lace their Coffee with Controverſie, *they may* lace *it with ſomewhat elſe, or elſe drink it* plain; *here being variety of Diſcourſes, as well as Liquors, and a great* Liberty of Conſcience *of calling for what they pleaſe. Neither is Diſputation it ſelf ſuch a Nuiſance to this Trade as Dr.* St. *imagins; for let but the Doctor (ſince he thinks it no crime to go to a Coffee-houſe) honor one of them with his Preſence, tho' with a* Diſputing *deſign, and I will undertake it ſhall have Cuſtom enough, and particularly Mr. G.'s as often as he is in Town.*

This Marginal Note is too long: but the matter lay ſo near my Road, that I could not forbear the taking a view of it.

to make out; for as my ſaying that ſome Lyes were told in Coffee-houſes, did not reflect on all thoſe who frequented them, (nay, I was then actually endeavouring to excuſe the *frequenting them*) ſo neither could my intimating that the Pulpits had been liable to ſome part of that Misfortune, concern all thoſe who Preached in them. Indeed my Complement (as the Doctor calls it) was ſo far from being deſign'd by me to all the *London-Clergy*, that I directed it not to Dr. *St.* himſelf, any farther than his own Conſcience ſhould look on it as belonging to him. However, had he taken it to himſelf, I ſhould not have contended ſo much to have reſcu'd it out of his hands. I queſtion not but there is a great deal of ſincerity amongſt the *London-Clergy*, and even ſo much as to acknowledge, that every individual Member of that Body hath it not. And, after all, had it been true (as it was not) that I had reflected on this whole Clergy; what had That been in compariſon of Dr. *Teniſon*'s *——If you are a Papiſt, &c.* which takes in ſo many Coun-

Countreys and Ages, and even his own Sovereign?

These are two Instances what Use these Gentlemen can make of their *Inferring Faculties*, when they see it for their purpose. Is there any thing here half so plain, or so naturally deduced, as that which I drew from Dr. *Tenison*'s Proposition? Nay rather, are not the Inferences of these two Doctors evidently forced, whereas mine is genuine, and obvious even to the meanest Understanding? And yet *base and unworthy ways of catching men*, are laid to my charge, and these Gentlemen pass for Plain-dealers. But this will not always be so. There is a time to come, in which *there will be nothing of what is now hidden, but what shall be revealed.* And then it will appear how ill a choice those have made, who have preferred Fame before Truth, and the saving of their Credit before the saving of their Souls.

The Doctor says farther, *That for his part he thought his Loyalty at this time to be more* valuable *than Mr.* M.'*s, because he, as a Son of the Church of* England, *professed he would not* Rebel *against the King, notwithstanding he might be of another Religion: whereas Mr.* M. *being of the same Religion, could not so well separate Loyalty from Interest.*

Now, *for my part*, tho' I hold *Works of Supererogation*, yet I am far from thinking Loyalty (at least, as it is here * describ'd) to be one of those: And therefore it is my opinion, that we ought as little *to value* our selves on our not being Rebels, as we would do on our not being Thieves or Murderers; nay, rather less, forasmuch as Theft and Murther are certainly less Criminal than Rebellion. And

* Viz. *A not* Rebelling *against the King.*

therefore a Loyalty to be boasted of (if there be any such) must be somewhat more than an ordinary Obedience. However, if the Doctor think his Loyalty at this time more *valuable* than mine, because he demeans himself peaceably under a Prince of a different Religion, he ought to remember, that for *three years* which he hath lived so, it has fallen to my share to pass over *twelve* in the same manner, only with this difference, that *He* enjoys entire Priviledges of a Free-born Subject, (sitting under a *large* Fig-tree, and gathering the Fruit of a *well-spread* Vine) and is promis'd the continuance of them; having no other * cause of disquiet, save only (what ought to prompt him to nothing but Gratitude) the bare Contemplation, that were it not for the Goodness of his Sovereign, it might have been otherwise. These, I say, are his Enjoyments during this great trial of his Fidelity: whereas I, on the other side, during my Probation, was not only debarr'd of those Advantages which my Education might have pretended to, but for some time even of the Open Air; and even this kind of Life was so precariously enjoy'd by us, and we were so far from being *assured* of any Continuance of it, that were it not for our Confidence in God's Mercy, we could have expected nothing else but immediate Destruction. Now, when these two things are put into the Ballance; I mean the two different Trials of Dr. *Tenison*'s Loyalty and *Mine*; I cannot but think that the Advantage will be on my side: and this even tho' the Doctor himself (which perhaps is a bold word) should hold the Scales. Wherefore, if any *value* accrue to Loyalty from such kind of Trials, *That* certainly which has undergon the longest and severest,

**Unless perhaps a Restraint from vexing others, and consequently the want of the old & more effectual method of* silencing Jesuits, *be an inconvenience to him.*

reſt, ought to be the moſt prized. Neither is there any reaſon why my Loyaly ſhould loſe that *value* in the Calm, which (according to this Rule) it muſt have acquir'd in the Storm. On the contrary, it is then chiefly that the Labours of a Souldier are conſidered, when the War is at an end; and even by Rewards his Merit is not leſſen'd (tho' his Pretenſion be) but declared.

For which reaſons it is probable that this *Compariſon* of the Doctor will appear to the World to have many more Grains of Self-Love, than of Conſideration: And for my own part, I cannot but look on it as an ill ſign, that Loyalty ſhould ſit ſo heavy on any Man's ſhoulders at this time of day, and amidſt ſo much eaſe and ſecurity, as to be thought a thing of any weight.

Beſides, had the Doctor been that *Loyal Man* he pretended, tho' he had thought me a little too *haſty* in this occaſion; ought he to have ſnapt me up ſo diſcourteouſly, and with ſo much bitterneſs of Spirit, for an expreſſion, which, tho' taken by him for ill-grounded, could not but be look'd on as Loyal? Methinks (I ſay) the Loyalty of my Admonition might have made ſome Attonement for the *ſuppoſed* Error of it; and the Doctor, who is ſo good at giving *Grains of Allowance*, might (one would think) have extended his Charity to Me alſo; eſpecially when the Zeal for Loyalty needed not to have been extraordinary in him, for the overlooking of ſo ſmall a Fault. Page 7.

Similis ſimili gaudet: Had the Doctor been as much a Loyaliſt in his Heart, as (ſeemingly at leaſt) he was the contrary in his words, he would have cheriſhed Loyalty, where-ever he had found it, even tho'

even tho' mingled with ſome Indiſcretion. He may remember how cordially the *Old* and *Loyal* Church-of-*England*-men and the *Roman Catholics* lov'd one another during the Civil Wars; when the difference of Perſuaſion was not more powerful to divide their Underſtandings, than a conſtant Fidelity to their Prince to unite their Affections. But theſe days are ſomewhat changed. The firſt Reformers (to give them their due) thought *nothing enough for the* * *King*; but it is to be feared there are ſome amongſt their Succeſſors, who think *every thing too much.* Wherefore the late Repreſenter of *Old* and *New* Popery may (if he pleaſes, for his diverſion) transfer his parallel Columns to his own Church. I queſtion not but he will be able to fill them: And for ſome Materials I would recommend him to a late * Work of one of his own Prelates; Others he may have in the **Various Tranſlations of the Scripture, Common-Prayer-Books, Rubricks, Forms of Ordination, and the like.**

* *Declaring him Head of their Church, and Supreme Governor in all Eccleſiaſtical and Spiritual Things or Cauſes. They cared not what* Church-*Power he took, ſo that he would exerciſe it in giving them* Church-*Livings.*

A Diſcourſe for Abrogating the Teſt, &c.

But after all, I will not much contend with Dr. *Teniſon* in the forementioned Point. I wiſh that he thought his Loyalty ten times more *valuable* than he does. The greater Treaſure he takes it for, the more careful in all probability he will be to preſerve it. And had the Doctor's eſteem for Loyalty been ſo extraordinary before our Acquaintance, his Diſcourſe had not drawn ſuch a fruitleſs Admonition from me, nor my Admonition ſo much unjuſt Anger from him.

There

There are ſeveral other Remarks which would offer themſelves to me on this Subject: But the Filth which is ſo copiouſly rak'd together in this Paragraph, is no ſuch inviting ſight, as that I ſhould continue to pore on it. However, there is one Obſervation which prevails with me for a little longer ſtay. I cannot but call to mind what Sacred things the *King's Witneſſes* were, during the late pretended Popiſh-Plot, notwithſtanding that thoſe who preſented themſelves for that Employment were known to be the moſt profligate Wretches alive: whereas as ſoon as that Phantôm vaniſh'd, and a *true Plot* (bred under the Shadow of this *falſe One*) was happily detected, then nothing was ſo ſcandalous with ſome Men as one of theſe *Witneſſes*; ſuch, I mean, as were then for the King: Such a ſtrange Perverſeneſs is there in ſome Natures, that what is for their turn, tho' ever ſo Diabolical, ſhall be Saintly with them; but what is otherwiſe, tho' Truth, Juſtice, or Piety, ſhall be look'd on as the moſt deteſtable thing in the World. Whil'ſt the Witneſſes were Falſe, it was a ſin to aſperſe them; but as ſoon as they came to be True, their former Treaſons were held leſs Crimes, than their preſent Diſcovery of them. And it was about this time, *viz.* whil'ſt the Real Plot was under Proſecution, that the Doctor's Nick name of *Evidence* began to come in uſe. Indeed the former Witneſſes were every way ſo abominable, that the very name of a Witneſs ſeem'd Ignominious; and therefore it was the eaſier for the Enemies of the Crown to repreſent that as *Odious* in it ſelf, which was only *ſo* when accompanied with Falſhood. And hence, inſtead

ſtead of vilifying Perjur'd Witneſſes in particular, they ſlily brought a diſcredit on all Witneſſes in general, at leaſt on Thoſe who (as I have ſaid) were for the King, and ſo falſly pretending to remedy one Evil, they endeavoured to introduce a Greater; it being certainly a leſs Miſchief to the Commonwealth, that ſome *Falſe* Witneſſes ſhould be believed, than that None ſhould be look'd on as *True*. Wherefore I hope the Doctor means ſomewhat worſe by the Nick-name he beſtows on me, than barely the *being a Witneſs for the King*, ſince (bleſſed be God) I am not yet ſo unmortified, but that I had rather be reputed a Falſe Evidence, tho' the worſt of Diſgraces, than that the being a *True Evidence on the King's behalf* ſhould be eſteemed a Diſgrace: It being better that His Majeſty ſhould want the Teſtimony of one ſingle Perſon, tho' ever ſo unjuſtly, than that he ſhould be depriv'd of That of all his Subjects.

This Pamphlet grows more bulky than I intended; and therefore, having ſaid as much as I thought fit on the things contain'd in Dr. *Teniſon*'s Narrative, I purpoſe to be much ſhorter concerning that which remains.

*Viz. *His Diff. betwixt Prot. and Socin. Meth.* p. 26.

The Doctor in his 57th Page quotes a * Work of his own in theſe Words; *Though he* [*the* Right Socinian] *thinks a Doctrin is plain in Scripture, yet if he believes it to be againſt* HIS REASON, *he aſſents not to it.* And p. 27. *A Man of this Church* [*of* England] *ſuſpects not* Reaſon it ſelf, *but his own* preſent Art of Reaſoning, *whenſoever it concludes againſt that which he reads, and reads without doubting of the Senſe*

Senſe of the Words. This he lays down for the Difference between the Church of *England* and the *Socinians.*

Hitherto I have taken the Socinians *at leaſt* for a witty Generation: But henceforward, if the Doctor's Character of them be true, I muſt hold them all for Blockheads, on pain of being held for one my ſelf. For what is it *to think a Doctrin plain in* * *Scripture*, but *to think it to be revealed by God?* And conſequently, what is it *not to believe a Doctrin which is thought to be plain in Scripture*, but *not to believe what is thought to be revealed by God?* And is not this in other terms to ſuppoſe *that it is poſſible for God to reveal a Falſhood?* Wherefore if this be the ſign of a *Right Socinian*, as the Doctor would have it, a *Bedlam* is fitter for him than an *Inquiſition.* But the truth is, the Socinians are not ſuch Fools as this Gentleman would make them; They do not think the Doctrin they reject to be plain in Scripture: Nay, before they reject it, they conclude it not to be * plain. Wherefore in thoſe points wherein they differ from the Catholics, what the One underſtands Literally in the Word of God, the Other interprets Myſtically or Figuratively. And in reference to theſe Texts they behave themſelves no otherwiſe than the Proteſtants do towards thoſe Words of our Savior in the Inſtitution of the Bleſſed Sacrament, *viz. This is my Body*; which they will not underſtand in a Literal Senſe.

* *Suppoſing Scripture to be the Word of God.*

* *The* Arians *and* Socinians *are ſo far from thinking the Catholic Doctrin touching the Divinity of our Savior to be* plain *in Scripture, that they think the contrary to be* plainly *there; bringing for it many Texts; as,* My Father is greater than I, *Joh.* 14. 28. *and the like; which the Doctor knows well enough.*

Again, the Doctor ſays, That a Church-of-England-man *ſuſpects not Reaſon it ſelf, but his own preſent Art of Reaſoning.* I have not time to ſpeculate on the nicety of this Diſtinction, and ſo I let it paſs; altho' I believe that a Socinian would be extreme glad to know how he might come to be guided by *Reaſon it ſelf*, when he *ſuſpects his preſent Art of Reaſoning* *. Is not the Faculty to be ſuſpected, when its Operation is faulty? Can the Reaſon be Perfect, and yet the Reaſoning which flows from it Defective? But whereas the Doctor's Church-of-*England*-man *ſuſpects his own preſent Art of Reaſoning, whenſoever it concludes againſt that which he reads, and reads without doubting of the Senſe of the Words:* I dare likewiſe engage, that whatſoever the *Right* Socinian reads in Scripture without *doubting* of the Senſe of the Words, he ſhall believe as firmly as any Church-of-*England*-man in the World. This is proved already; and if the Doctor think otherwiſe, I ſhall have cauſe to ſuſpect (if not his *Reaſon*, yet at leaſt) his *preſent Art of Reaſoning*.

* *What cauſeth a Church-of-England-man to ſuſpect his preſent Art of Reaſoning? Is it not his preſent Art of Reaſoning? Can Reaſon guide him without any Reaſoning? The Doctor ſeems to be very ſubtil here.*

The Reaſon why I have examined this Quotation is, becauſe it is taken out of a Book, which I am recommended to by the Doctor for an Anſwer to thoſe Queſtions I would have propos'd to him at the Conference. The Readers have my ſenſe * already concerning the Anſwering of ſhort Queſtions [and *propoſed* in a Perſonal Conference] by a Reference to long Books: which ſeems to be but the *putting off the Trial* at beſt. What Encouragement I have from this *Quotation* to have recourſe to that

* *Above* p. 73. & ſequ.

that Book in particular, out of which it was* choſen by the Author himſelf, let them *Judge*. For, if we may gueſs at the Stuff by the Pattern, they will be able to do it.

* *But if this be the* choice, *what is the* refuſe?

A. P. *preſs'd Writing* (ſays the Doctor, pag. 60.) *yet when Dr.* T. *began to do ſo, he declin'd it.* The Reader will have * ſeen, that *A. P.* had a great deal of reaſon to *decline* the ſigning an inſignificant Wrangle about the Authority of one ſingle Book, which was all the *Writing* Dr. *T.* propos'd; and that the Doctor had no *Reaſon* at all to *decline* what was *propos'd* to him, *viz. the writing of the whole Conference*, unleſs it be *ſuch* as he will be loth to own.

* *Above*, p. 67. *& ſeq. See alſo Mr. P.'s Acc.* p. 10. *& ſeq.*

. *Whereabouts* (proceeds Dr. *T.*) *would theſe Diſputers be? A while ago they were all for* Verbal *Conferences, when* Written *ones were offer'd, as more ſafe and uſeful*; Now *when* Verbal *Conferences are agreed to,* Writing *is preſs'd.* What a pretty Sophiſm is here? Does not Dr. *Teniſon* know *whereabouts theſe Diſputers would be?* Did not thoſe who were all for *Verbal* (or rather *Perſonal*) Conferences, deſire that the *Argumentative* part of ſuch Conferences might be taken in * *Writing*; and that nothing elſe might be publiſhed as Authentic, but what was ſo written? And were not Conferences ſo managed, *viz. Perſonally and by Writing*, * preferr'd before the carrying on of a Diſputation by Books, and not *Verbal* Conferences, (as the Doctor inſinuates) before *Written* ones? Was the Doctor ignorant of this? I do not think he was. But a pretended Miſtake is an excellent Inſtrument in the hand of a Controvertiſt. It ſerves to deceive his own

Pag. 60.

* Viz. *for binding ſuch after miſrepreſentations as we have had from our Dr. as I ſaid before*, pa. 61.

* *See the above-mentioned Letter to Dr.* E. S. p. 26. *& ſeq.*

Party, and, *at leaſt*, to make Work for his Adverſaries.

And now I would not have the Senſe of what I have ſaid here, or elſewhere, on this Subject, ſo far miſtaken, as that I ſhould be thought to look on ſuch *Perſonal* and *Written* Conferences as infallible means of deciding Controverſies; whereas I only prefer this way of proceeding in them before that of writing Books. I know there is nothing of this Nature, which ſome time or other is not liable to the underminings of Craft; and therefore (as far as I have been able to obſerve) when ſuch kind of Conferences are obtained, (which is only where they cannot be kept off with any credit) the Proteſtants either refuſe to diſpute of the Main Points, ſuch as the Rule of Faith, the Proof of Scripture, or the like, and fall on ſome other Branch, where (as I have ſaid before) there is more room for diſputing, unleſs the matter be ſoon brought to the Rule of Faith, as it may, and indeed ought to be: Or elſe, if they admit of any ſuch Point, they endeavor to ſpend the time in Preliminaries, ſo that they may be forced to break off before any Argument comes to bear. All the Written Conferences that I have heard of (which have not been above two or three) have been of this ſort. However the Truth of what paſſes at a Conference is better known by this means, and the ſhuffling (on which ſide ſoever it ſhall happen to be) more diſcernible. Beſides I never knew that any of theſe Conferences were followed by Noiſe, tho' the Copies of them have been diſtributed through many hands. All things have been huſh'd, and no contradictory Narratives have come abroad

abroad to the *dividing*, rather than *ſatisfying* the World: Excepting only Dr. *St.*'s Conference with Mr. G. where Mr. G.'s Amanuenſis happening to take away his Copy without comparing it with Dr. *St.*'s, there chanced to be a ſmall difference between thoſe Copies which Mr. G. diſperſed, and that which the Doctor retained; and from this trivial Over-ſight (to ſay the utmoſt of it) Dr. *St.* took a pretence to accuſe Mr. G. of Inſincerity, and to refuſe the meeting with him any more. But this (as is evident) may eaſily be prevented, and Mr. *G.* himſelf did it afterwards, *viz.* by truſting the Proteſtants themſelves to write both his part and their own, and then taking his Copies from them: So far was he from deſiring that any Forgery or the leaſt Falſification, ſhould be in ſuch Copies. And after theſe Conferences (as I have ſaid) we have been very quiet. And certainly, if there were no other convenience in Writing, This alone were enough to render it deſirable. And as for the Conferences themſelves, tho' (as I have ſaid) there is care taken to ſpend the time (which the Writing alſo helps to do) in uſeleſs Diſcourſes, yet after the firſt or ſecond Meeting, when all the looſe Earth ſhall be digg'd away in order to a Foundation, it is probable that ſomewhat may be built. —— But the worſt of the matter is, that for the moſt part we are careful to take ſuch Exceptions at the Firſt Meeting, as may juſtifie our refuſal of a Second.

He ſays (pag. 64.) *Mr.* M. *ſtay'd much longer*, (*viz.* than what Mr. *P.* mentions) *for he began to write on the back of Dr.* T.*'s Paper.* This *writing* was

was not till after I had retir'd from Dr. *T.* and Mr. *P.* and came back again to them, according to what I have related above. And this may be farther proved from what the Schoolmaster says in his 9th page, viz. *When the Question of* [*How the Protestants could tell that the Bible they used was really what they (the Protestants) thought it to be, the Word of God?*] *had been canvass'd some while, Mr.* M. *arising, went to the other end of the Room*, &c. Now this Question was at the beginning of the Conference, as appears by Dr. *Tenison*'s own Narrative; whereas the *writing* was not till after the Question of *Transubstantiation* had been started.

He goes on; *And he* [*Mr.* M.] *removed, upon a Gentlewomans coming to him with a Masque in her hand; which gave occasion to another of that* [illegible] *to say to Mr.* M. *He chose to dispute rather with Ladies than Doctors.* I acquainted my Readers in my 5th page, That not long after the beginning of our Disputation, a Catholic Gentlewoman advis'd me to withdraw from it. But really whether she had a Masque in her hand, or not, I cannot tell; and therefore herein I must yield to the Doctor, and confess that He is the more curious *Observer of Ladies* of the two. Neither did she come then into the Conference, as the Doctor seems to express it, but had been there for some time; for she had observed that Dr. *Tenison* took the advantage of my being near him, to turn frequently from Mr. *P.* to me, and * so *vice versâ* from Me to Him, by which means the Prosecution of the Arguments was hindred. And it was for this reason (as she told me) and also that the Doctor might not have a false pretence of his *contending with two at once*, that she desired

* *Above* pa. 5.

fired me to retire, according to the account I have given of this matter in the afore-cited place. It was not therefore *to avoid diſputing with Dr.* Teniſon, as the Doctor's Lady ſurmized (for it ſeems there were *Ladies* on both ſides) that I withdrew, but it was *that the Doctor might not avoid diſputing with Mr.* P. And if I am not miſtaken, I was then talking with the Schoolmaſter, when this Witticiſm [recorded by the Doctor] was ſpoken. There was a ſecond Gentlewoman who joyn'd with *this* in the ſame Advice; but neither of them ſpoke before Mr. *P.* had deſir'd me of his own accord to leave the Diſputation, tho' the Doctor ſeems here to ſuppoſe the contrary.

The Doctor takes occaſion in ſeveral places of his Book to give us to underſtand that the foremention'd Apprentice was much chang'd in Humor and Countenance after his Converſion, and particularly *that he ſeem'd often as if he were* mop'd.* And Dr. *Hornec* ſeems to concur with him in this account. We know what kind of Spectacles Love and Hatred are to look through, and how much for the moſt part they impoſe upon our Fancies. Certainly the Boy's * *ſmiling* at Dr. *H.*'s *pretending to Succeſſion* was no ſign of Stupidity; the wiſeſt man in the World might have been guilty of ſome *Laughter* on that occaſion. But for my own part, that which I think moſt worth the *ſmiling* at in this paſſage, is that Dr. *H.* makes *no bones* of proving this Succeſſion; whereas Dr. *T.* ſaid at the Conference, that it could not be done under Ten Thouſand Pounds worth of Books. *Something* (ſays Dr. *H.*) *I dropt* accidentally about Succeſſion, which he laid hold of, and with a kind*

* Pag. 2.

Pag. 79. *in Dr.* H.'s *Letter.*

* *I ſuppoſe it was* accidentally, *Succeſſion being a Point which of their good will they* ſeldom mention.

kind of ſcornful ſmile *demanded,* What Succeſſion we could ſhew? *I told him both for* Men *and* Doctrin, *and* Prov'd *it to him.* How light does *this* Doctor make of that which is ſuch a Bugbear to the *other?* It is much that Dr. *Teniſon* had not learnt that Receipt of proving a *Succeſſion of Proteſtants* from his Brother before his Publication of the Conference, that ſo he might not have put us off in a Queſtion of ſo much Importance with * Deſpair inſtead of Satisfaction. And therefore I am apt to think that Dr. *T.* gave not much credit to this part of Dr. *H.*'s Letter, whatever he did to the reſt.

* Pag. 13.

There is but one way (that I know) of reconciling theſe two Doctors, and that is by laying it down as a Principle, *That there are* Two *ways of Manifeſting a Proteſtant Succeſſion.* One is, *by ſhewing Societies or Perſons in all Ages, who have openly profeſſed the Doctrin of the Church of England.* And this, I preſume, cannot be perform'd under Ten or Twenty Thouſand Pounds worth of Books. And even after all, it is my opinion that the * Money will be able to make it out better without the Books, than with them. The other is, *by ſaying* (according to Dr. *Jackſon*'s Notion) *that the Church of* England *before the Reformation was in the Church of* Rome; and then the *Proof* of this *Succeſſion* will come very cheap, and if you give *Six-pence* for it, it will be more than it is worth. Now for ſuch as will not or cannot go to the price of the former, (which I take to be the Boy's caſe) it is but reaſonable that they ſhould be contented with the latter. If the Doctors think

* *What makes all Doctrins plain and clear? About two hundred pounds a year.* Hudib.

* *See above,* pag. 41.

think that I am ſomewhat too light on this Occaſion, they muſt pardon me; for I knew not how to make them agree on better Terms.

THE

APPENDIX.

WHil'ſt theſe latter Sheets were in the Preſs, Dr. *Teniſon*'s new Book [entituled, *Mr.* Pulton *Conſidered*] came forth. I caſt my Eye on it; but having read the Preface, I found ſo many things which requir'd the Black Note, that I was afraid to enter farther into the Book, leſt I ſhould be overwhelm'd with matter, and ſo either tempted to lengthen my own Pamphlet, (which I would not willingly do) or elſe remain under a kind of vexation by ſeeing many Fallacies without expoſing them when they ſhould ſeem to lie in my way. Wherefore, to avoid both theſe Inconveniences, I deſir'd a Friend who had read the Book to inform me what there was in it that had any relation to my ſelf, that ſo I might either note, or neglect it, as I ſhould ſee cauſe. And as for the reſt of this *Worthy Piece* (wherein the Doctor, as far as I obſerved him, hath outdone himſelf in many of thoſe laudable Qualities I have ſpoken of above) I knew that ſo far as it ſhould be thought neceſſary,

it would be under the Examination of a better Artiſt.

The Doctor ſays in his forementioned Preface, That he went to this Conference *in the ſimplicity of a Chriſtian, as to a private Diſcourſe*; *which* (ſays he) *the Arts of others have improv'd into a public Brawl.* Whom the Doctor means by *others* in this place, I cannot well tell: But I am apt to imagin, that They who were conſcious either of the Weakneſs of their Cauſe before the Conference, or of their ill Succeſs in it, would not be over-fond of making the thing public. For my part, I am ſo charitable as to think there were no *Arts* uſed by either Side for this purpoſe; the buſineſs was ſo carried, that it could not well be otherwiſe: Nay, there were ſo many Hearers of both Sexes, (and *Five* of the Doctor's Party for *One* of ours) at this Conference, that it had been the greateſt Art in the World to have kept it ſecret: But for the admittance of theſe People, if there were any fault in it, I know not whom to blame, unleſs it be the Maſter of the Houſe, who doubtleſſy might have refuſed entrance to as many as he pleaſed. But perhaps the Good Man reckon'd upon nothing leſs than a complete Victory, and (in conſequence of that) the Recovery of his *loſt Sheep*, and therefore (according to a *Goſpel-Example*, tho' ſomewhat too ſoon) invited his Neighbors and Acquaintance to rejoyce with him. And if this proved inconvenient to the Doctor, he may learn by it, that it is not always for his advantage that his Pariſhioners ſhould have too great an Opinion of him; but in the mean time there is no manner of reaſon why he ſhould be angry at Us, becauſe his own Admi-

rers

rers were miſtaken; unleſs it be *ſuch* as men that ſtumble have of quarrelling with thoſe who ſhall happen to be near them, tho' they contributed nothing to their Miſchance.

He goes on to amuſe his Pariſhioners, by telling them of high Accuſations lay'd by Catholic Writers on ſeveral of his Brethren, of *Inſincerity*, *Diſingenuity*, *Want of Modeſty*, and the like. And this Charge is ſet forth by a *pompous Company* of Great and Reverend Names, that in view of ſo much *Reverence* and Grandeur, our Diſreſpect may appear the more Notorious. It is pity that ſo much Art ſhould be ſo ill employ'd. Are theſe terms of *Inſincerity*, *Diſingenuity*, &c. any thing elſe but the plain and ſimple (nay, the ſofteſt) Appellations of ſuch things as theſe Gentlemen are taxed with? Let them forbear to do, or prove they have not done, what they are unwilling ſhould be named, and all will be well. If they have any thing to ſay againſt thoſe Proofs wherewith we endeavor to make good our Accuſations, it will be to their purpoſe; but as long as they ſhall give us Occaſion for Complaints, they muſt be contented to receive them in ſuch Language as our Anceſtors have left us, 'till they themſelves ſhall teach us one that is more to their ſatisfaction.

And yet what are theſe Terms which the Doctor complains of, in compariſon of thoſe which the Ancient Fathers beſtowed on the Separatiſts of their Time, and that meerly for Deſerting the Church, and without regard to any ſiniſter way they might take in particular to ſupport and juſtifie their Schiſm? To omit a multitude of Inſtances to this purpoſe, be pleaſed to hearken to St. *Auguſtin*

guſtin (who was far from wanting Compaſſion for ſuch as were ſeduc'd by Hereſie) and obſerve how he delivers himſelf in reſpect of a Reformer of thoſe days. * *That Church which was compoſed out of all Nations is no more*; *ſhe is periſhed*; [or, in our Modern *Reformation-Language*, corrupted.] *This*, ſays he, *is the ſaying of thoſe who are not in the Church. O impudent ſaying! Is ſhe not, becauſe thou art not in her?*—— *This moſt abominable and hateful ſaying, full of Preſumption and Falſhood, deſtitute of Truth, void of Wiſdom, inſipid, vain, raſh, precipitate, pernicious, was foreſeen by the Spirit of God*, &c. Such, and much more, was the Language of theſe Holy men on ſuch occaſions. The Apoſtles themſelves, notwithſtanding that Meekneſs which they learnt from their Bleſſed Maſter, both by Precept and Example, were no leſs liberal in this kind than others, as ſufficiently appears by all their Writings. St. *Jude* (to give you one Inſtance of theſe alſo) in that very Epiſtle wherein he reprehends Railing, is ſo far from thinking ſeverity of Language towards Schiſmatics to be ſo, that his whole Work ſeems to be nothing elſe but (if I may ſo ſpeak) an *Holy* Invective againſt them. He calls them *Ungodly Men*, and compares them to *Brute Beaſts*: By and by he ſtiles them, *Followers of* Cain, Balaam, *and* Core; *Spots, Clouds without Water, carried about of Wind, Trees without Fruit, twice dead and pluck'd up by the Roots*; *Raging Waves of the Sea, Wandring Stars, Mockers in the laſt time*, with much more of this nature.

* Sed illa Eccleſia, quæ fuit omnium Gentium, jam non eſt, periit.—Hoc dicunt, qui in illâ non ſunt. O impudentem vocem! Illa non eſt, quia tu in illâ non es? Hanc vocem abominabilem & deteſtabilem, præſumptionis & falſitatis plenam, nullâ Veritate ſuffultam, nullâ Sapientiâ illuminatam, nullo Sale conditam, vanam, temerariam, præcipitem, pernicioſam, prævidit Spiritus Dei, &c. *D. Aug. Enarr. 2. in Pſalm.* 101.

nature. And laſtly, that we may know whom he means by all this, he gives us their *Mark* and their *Crime* in one ſingle word: *Theſe* (ſays he) *be they who* SEPARATE *themſelves.* This therefore being the Phraſe of the Apoſtles and Saints, *(viz.* ſo ſharp, ſo penetrating, ſo full of perfect abhorrence*)* towards thoſe who violated, what they had ſo tender a concern for, the Unity of the Church; I ſhall need few words for the Juſtification of a ſharpneſs of Language, which comes far ſhort of theirs. For if bare Separation deſerv'd ſo much ſeverity, what ſhall we ſay when erroneous Doctrin is added to Separation, and both are maintained by unjuſt and fraudulent Proceedings? On the contrary, I am afraid it would be a harder task to excuſe that coldneſs wherewith we often treat ſuch things as theſe. It may very well be apprehended, that whil'ſt we play the Courtiers too much in Controverſie, we may leave the Crimes of Hereſie and Schiſm diveſted of that Horrour wherewith they ought always to be repreſented. And therefore, to ſay the truth, it was not ſo much for the defence of the ſeverity of our Language towards Proteſtants that I have choſen theſe two Inſtances out of numberleſs others of the ſame time, and to the ſame purpoſe; but it was chiefly that I might take this occaſion of ſhewing my Readers what great apprehenſions the Primitive Chriſtians had of thoſe things whereof now-adays we make ſo little account, that ſo what the Age will not bear from my Pen, they may receive from thoſe whom they pretend to follow. *There is but little difference* (ſay ſome) *between Us and the Catholics*; as if that were little for which the Unity of the Church

is

is broken; or, indeed, as if the meer breach of that Unity were little. Let them who have this thought, conſider theſe two paſſages which I have cited, and for farther ſatisfaction (if they ſhall yet want it) compare on the ſame Subject the reſt of the Scriptures with the One, and the reſt of the Fathers with the other, and then it is probable they will be of another Opinion. I am ſure they will have reaſon to be ſo.

I intimated, that the principal Deſign of my alledging the Examples of St. *Jude* and St. *Auguſtin*, was not to defend the ſharp Language of our Controvertiſts: This indeed had been ſuperfluous, and my Readers might well have blam'd me for an unneceſſary Paragraph. For beſides that what I ſaid at firſt of the neceſſity we are in of uſing ſuch Expreſſions is abundantly ſufficient for their excuſe, we have the Example of our very Accuſers for the ſame ſharpneſs, ſhould we ſtand in need of any farther juſtification: For could but Dr. *Teniſon* conſider Himſelf and his Friends but half ſo narrowly as he doth his Adverſaries, he would find that thoſe Reverend Gentlemen he mentions are not behind-hand with us on that ſcore, but rather they give us two for one. What I have collected out of his own Pamphlet may ſerve for a ſmall Inſtance. There are other Books as well ſtor'd: But what need of more? It is well known, that *Superſtitious*, *Idolatrous*, *Antichriſtian*, *Deviliſh*, *&c.* are Terms of courſe, and as ancient as that of *Papiſts*. And indeed, as the matter is now between us, if ſharpneſs were an undoubted ſign of an Apoſtolical Spirit, They would paſs for Apoſtles, and We for Schiſmatics. It is true there is a difference between

ſharpneſs

ſharpneſs and ſcurrility, and therefore we ought to be careful that whil'ſt we imitate the Fathers in the One, we may not follow the Heretics in the Other; the One being the reſult of Zeal, the Other of Malice. And this laſt kind of Eloquence was heard ſo early amongſt our Reformers, (witneſs *Luther*'s eſpecial Talent in this way) that it may well be termed the *Vagitus* or *Firſt-Cries* of the Reformation.

But, ſays the Doctor, *They ſay this ill of us, not becauſe we are ſuch, but becauſe we are not theirs.* This he SAYS, and becauſe * *Defending* and *Proving* is ſo *diſagreeable* an Employment to him, he expects that his Pariſhioners (who * *paſs as high Obligations on their Paſtor as man can have to man*) will continue their *high Obligations* ſo far as to believe him without *Proof*.

* *Ep. Ded. in his new Book.*

* *Ep. to his Pariſhioners in his firſt Book.*

He tells them by and by, *That* J. S. *is now under better hands.* This looks like an Inſinuation, as if there were ſome hopes of reclaiming him. I thought the Boy had been paſt recovery. He was aſſured (as he ſays in the 3d page of his Narrative) that *this Conference would be to no purpoſe as to the Boy.* And ſince neither Dr. *Hornec*'s *Things of Moment*, nor Dr. *Teniſon*'s Great Conference, wherein Nine (ſome ſay *Fifteen*) Jeſuits were ſilenced, could do any good upon this Youth, he had ſo much *perverſeneſs* in his heart, and ſo * *ſtrange a figure in his Countenance*, it is probable that thoſe *Hands* from which the Doctor ſeems to hope ſo great ſucceſs, muſt go ſome other way to work with him, than by (what the Doctor doth not care for) *Defending* and *Proving*.

* Pag. 3.

* Pag. 2.

In

In Dr. *T.*'s former Volume we had ſome *Confeſſions* and *Retractations*, and might have imagined that a new St. *Auguſtin* had riſen up amongſt us: But in This he retracts his Retractations, and ſo St. *Auguſtin* (* *as it were*) *vaniſhes away*, and Dr. *Teniſon* is left us in his ſtead. When he publiſhed his firſt Book, he voluntarily owned *what he* THEN *thought leſs decent*. But his Friends *reprov'd* him, *for making* Apologies *for* Warmneſſes *which they cannot find*: And he will not ſo much *ſuſpect their Sagacity*, as to imagin they are in the wrong; eſpecially where the *ſuſpecting* it is ſo little for his Credit. Wherefore he now changes his Note. In his firſt Epiſtle to theſe Pariſhioners, he ſpoke thus: *What I ſaid either with leſs* Strength *or more* Warmth *than I ought, I have ſet down, and laid it before your Charity. It may be I have a motive to ſevere Language towards* that ſort *of* Men, *which few have beſides me.* Then he tells the Story of *Gubbard*, and concludes, *This Inſtance of ſuch groſs Hypocriſie and Injuſtice made Impreſſion upon me when I was young, and ſo raiſed my* Suſpicion *and* Indignation, *that where I have met with any thing of a like nature, it has been ſome* difficulty *to me to temper my ſelf: But nothing* (*I hope*) *ſhall ever ſo tranſport me, as to prevent the doing of my Duty among you*, &c. Here the Doctor asks pardon for ſome *Warmneſſes* of his at the Conference, and endeavors in ſome meaſure to excuſe them, by letting his Pariſhioners know what a peculiar *Motive* he had to ſevere Language, from the Impreſſion that was made on him in his Youth by *Gubbard*'s Behavior. And in the cloſe he ſeems to tell them, That altho' perhaps his Wrath may have been

* *Ep. to his Par. in his firſt Book.*

been somewhat excessive towards a certain *sort of men* whom he points at in the beginning, yet his Parishioners are so Good and so *Generous*, that he hopes that no *Transport* will ever hinder him from being their humble *Servant*. This, I say, one would take to be the plain Construction of the foregoing words: And I doubt not but the Parishioners understood him just in this manner. But we are all mistaken: The Doctor says he means no such thing; and surely it belongs to him to know what he means. * *The Indignation he spoke of, was towards* Hypocrisie *and* Injustice, *and not towards* Persons *and* Orders: *His Resentment, such as it was, reasonable; and as for his Memory, it offer'd him a wholsom Admonition.* What is become of the *Faults*, and the *Excuse?* Here is every thing just as it should be. How comes the Doctor to have so *peculiar* a motive to hate *Hypocrisie* and *Injustice?* Does he not think that other people may have as great *Motives* as He to hate those two Vices? And is it not *Motive* enough for their being hated, to consider that they are highly displeasing to Almighty God? But how comes a *Motive to severe Language against a sort of Men*, to be nothing else but a *Motive* to Indignation against Vice? *The Jesuit* (says the Doctor) *would fix that* Indignation *I spake of upon* Persons *and* Orders, *when in express words I make the Object of it to be* Hypocrisie *and* Injustice. The Doctor then fixeth his *Indignation* upon *Hypocrisie* and *Injustice*; but on what will he fix his *Suspicion* which he joyns with his *Indignation* in the same Sentence? Has that nothing to do with * *Persons* neither?

* *See his Epist. Ded. in his new Book.*

* *To suspect Hypocrisie, is to suspect some person or persons guilty of it, or to suspect that it will make them Instruments of some further Mischief, which is still to suspect the persons.*

Surely they amongſt whom ſuch Language paſſes, ought not to inveigh againſt Equivocation. In his firſt Letter he complain'd, *that the Impreſſions of his Youth made it difficult for him to temper himſelf*: But here he declares, *that his Memory offer'd him a wholſom Admonition.* How comes that which is ſo *wholſom* to bring the Doctor ſo near to a *Diſtemper*? Or why ſhould the Doctor endeavor by *tempering himſelf* to reſtrain his hatred againſt Vice, *viz.* againſt *that* which deſerves an infinite Hatred? And laſtly, how happens it that ſo juſt an Indignation, and ſo *reaſonable* a Reſentment, ſhould occaſion ſuch *Tranſports* as ſhould make him apprehenſive of being hindred from *doing his Duty* among his Pariſhioners? Deteſtation of Sin is no ſuch improper quality in a Paſtor, unleſs it be where a Paſtor thinks it *his Duty* to flatter his Pariſhioners, which ought to be no-where.

No, *Doctor*; your Gloſs will not ſerve the turn. Your firſt thoughts were too well worded to be miſinterpreted by your ſecond; and therefore we will no more part with this ſtory, than with that of *Luther and the Devil.*

But if you pleaſe you ſhall have my Comment on it alſo; which, if I am not miſtaken, is much more probable than Yours. Briefly thus: You thought this Story of *Gubbard* would make the ſame Impreſſion on your Pariſhioners, as (you pretend) the thing it ſelf did on You: And this, you wiſely imagined, would be an excellent preparation of mind towards the reading of your Pamphlet. But it pleaſed God in his Juſtice to permit that whil'ſt you were ſo very intent on digging a Pit for others, you ſhould omit that care which was neceſſary for the keeping out of it your ſelf: For whil'ſt you endeavored

vored to make the Catholic Priests or Jesuits pass for Hypocrits and Oppressors, your own Story hath represented you as one of a rash Judgment, and of a Temper hardly to be appeased, and so whilst you undermined our Credit, you ruined your own; with such, at least, whose good Opinion is any credit.

Mr. *P.* had * said, *That* Gubbard *might have preached up* Purgatory, *and yet be neither* Priest nor Romanist, *as well as Mr.* Thorndyke *desire to have an* Ora pro Animâ *engraven on his Tomb, and yet die in the Communion of the Church of* England. * *Rem. Epist. Ded.*

The Doctor does not deny, but *in one sense* a man may hold *Purgatory* without being a *Romanist*: *For*, says he, *Bellarmin argues for a* Purgatory *out of the Poet* Virgil. *But* (proceeds the Doctor) *it was not certainly that* Purgatory *out of which men are relieved by Masses. And such a* Purgatory (*notwithstanding Mr.* P.'s *suggestion*) *Mr.* Thorndyke *could not hold, having forbidden his* Nieces *to* Marry *with any who should go to* Mass.

Mr. *P.* was no way inquisitive what *Purgatory* Mr. *Thorndyke* hold; it might be the Poet *Virgil*'s for ought he knew, (and so might *Gubbard*'s too for any thing the Doctor hath yet discovered) or he might hold none at all. [However it must be noted, That Mr. *Thorndyke* might have held a *Purgatory*, where Souls are *relieved* by Prayer, without holding it lawful to go to *Mass*.] All this was nothing to Mr. *P.*'s purpose; what he would evince being only, that the Belief of *Purgatory* could be no surer sign in *Gubbard* of his being a *Romanist*, than the Approbation of *Prayer for the Dead* was in

Mr. *Thorndyke*; either of these Points (forasmuch at least as concerns outward Profession) being as *Popish*, that is, belonging as peculiarly to the *Roman Catholic Religion*, as the other. But for the manner of understanding them, *Gubbard*'s Sense might, for ought we can tell, differ as much from the Roman Church, as Mr. *Thorndyke's*: as I intimated before.

For which reason, altho' (according to the Doctor's Suggestion) Mr. *Thorndyke*'s *Ora pro Animâ* should not have been *in* Mr. *Pulton*'s *way*, it sounded as if it were; and therefore was as sufficient for this surmise, as what the Doctor says of *Gubbard*. And what *way* soever this [*Ora pro Animâ*] was *in*, it was so far *out* of Dr. *Tenison*'s, that when he has put his best Construction on it, he judges it a *Weakness*, and so far again out of the Church of *England*'s, that tho' Mr. *Thorndyke*, as hath been said, died in their Communion, yet (it seems) they permitted not his Executor to comply with the *Earnest Charge* he lays on him by his Last *Will* of writing the following words on his Grave-stone, *viz. Tu, Lector, Requiem ei & beatam in Christo Resurrectionem precare*; which is, as near as I can render it, *Thou, O Reader, Pray for his Rest, and Happy Resurrection in Christ.*

* *See an Extract of the Will set down by Dr.* T. *after his Ep. in his new Book.*

He [Mr. *Thorndyke*] says the Doctor, *imitated some Christians about the* Fourth Age, *who wished* Rest *to none but those who, as they thought, already enjoy'd it. And even this* Wish *of theirs, if it had* Charity, *it had also (in my Opinion)* Weakness *in it.*

And

And truly it had ſo in my Opinion too (for I muſt not always differ with the Doctor) if they wiſhed Reſt to none but thoſe whom they ſuppoſed to enjoy it already. For, would it not be a *Weakneſs* in Me, (or in any one elſe whom the Doctor ſhould take for a better Friend) to wiſh that Dr. *Teniſon* were poſſeſs'd of the two Pariſhes of St. *Martin's* and St. *James's*. And if a man ſhould wiſh (tho' ever ſo heartily) that the Doctor had a great deal of Sincerity, I am afraid that he would take it for ſomewhat worſe than a Weakneſs, tho' at the ſame time the Party ſhould tell him, that he *imitated* ſome Chriſtians about the Fourth Age in wiſhing to Folks no more than what they believed they had already.

But why ſhould the Doctor fancy that thoſe Holy and Learned Men, I mean the Ancient Fathers, thoſe Pillars of Chriſtianity, during the firſt and pureſt Ages of the Church, and thoſe whom not only Mr. *Thorndyke*, but the whole Engliſh Reformation pretends to *imitate*; why, I ſay, ſhould he imagin that theſe Great Men were guilty of ſo much *Weakneſs*? Certainly if Chriſtian Religion be a * *Reaſonable Service*, we cannot think that the Beſt Chriſtians were the moſt *Unreaſonable* Men. * *Rom.* 12. 1.

Theſe Fathers pray'd for the Dead in moſt expreſs Terms; they offer'd Sacrifices for them; they begg'd of Almighty God to forgive them their ſins; they exhorted the Faithful to do the like; they declared that ſuch Prayers and Sacrifices were *beneficial* to the Souls of the Deceaſed. St. *Auguſtin* hath a whole * Book on this Subject, and there is ſcarce any one of the Fathers who hath not * Viz. *De cura pro Mortuis.*

ſomewhat

ſomewhat to the ſame purpoſe. And were all theſe *Doings* for nothing? Did they think that their Prayers would help none but thoſe who ſtood in no need of their help, which is as much as to ſay that they would help none at all? Certainly the Doctor cannot think this. But all Truths are not to be ſpoken at all times. It is better that the Fathers ſhould paſs for *Weak* Men in * Praying where they knew it was to no purpoſe, than that the Papiſts ſhould have ſo ſtrong a proof of *Purgatory* from the Conſent of the Ancient Church, *that the Dead in ſome caſes might be helped by the* Prayers *of the Living*. And their praying for none but whom they * *thought* to be already in Happineſs, is ſo far from being true, that they prayed not for the * Martyrs, meerly becauſe they concluded them to be *Happy*, and conſequently not to ſtand in need of their Prayers.

* *Would not ſuch* Praying *alſo be a* Mocking of God, *the* Taking his Name in vain, *and the* Being guilty of *idle words*, even at our Devotions?

* *If by* thought *he means* [*abſolutely ſuppoſed.*]

* Ideoq; habet Eccleſiaſtica diſciplina, quod Fideles noverunt, cùm Martyres recitantur ad Altare Dei; ubi non pro ipſis oretur, pro cæteris vero commemoratis *Defunctis* oratur: Injuria eſt enim pro Martyre orare; cujus nos debemus orationibus commendari. *St. Aug. Serm. 17. de verb. Ap. cap. 1.*

It is worth obſerving after what faſhion this matter is ſpoken of by the Doctor: *He imitated*, ſays he, *ſome Chriſtians about the Fourth Age*. By *ſome Chriſtians*, I ſuppoſe, he means all the Holy Fathers of that Time; and indeed he might have taken in the whole Catholic Church, in which, as * St. *Auguſtin*

* In *Machabæorum* libris legimus oblatum pro mortuis Sacrificium. Sed etſi nuſquam in Scripturis veteribus omninò legeretur, non parva tamen eſt Univerſæ Eccleſiæ, *quæ in hac Conſuetudine viget*, Authoritas; ubi in precibus Sacerdotis, quæ Domino Deo ad ejus Altare funduntur, locum ſuum habet etiam commendatio mortuorum. *St. Aug. lib. de Curâ pro mortuis. c. 1.*

guſtin aſſures us, this Practice of *Praying for the Dead* was Univerſal. By *about the Fourth Age*, I ſuppoſe he means the ſaid *Fourth*, and the two next to it both before and after, *viz.* the *Fifth* and the *Third*; and to theſe he might, if he had ſo pleaſed, have added the Two Firſt. So that we have the ſettled Cuſtom of all Antiquity deliver'd to us as the peculiar or private Practice of *ſome Chriſtians about the Fourth Age*. Neither is this without Myſtery: For having ſaid in his firſt Book, *p.* 16. that he would not *part* with the Fathers, and having now an occaſion of diſmiſſing them as *weak* men, he ſigns their Diſcharge in other Names, that he may not ſeem to be worſe than his word. When he can diſcover any thing in their Writings which may be wreſted for his purpoſe, they ſhall be as much *Fathers* as you pleaſe: but when he catches them holding a Popiſh Doctrin, they are out of Favor, and muſt be turn'd into *ſome Chriſtians about the Fourth Age*.

But if the Doctor means, by what he ſays in this place, that there were ſome Chriſtians about the time he mentions, who imagined that Souls could not be help'd by Prayers or Wiſhes, and therefore wiſh'd Reſt to none but whom they ſuppoſed to enjoy what they wiſh'd them, and ſo diſſented from the Univerſal Church, which (as hath been ſhewn) pray'd for the Dead out of another Principle: There might, for ought I know, have been *ſome* ſuch Chriſtians, but as yet I never heard of them.

Laſtly, if by *ſome Chriſtians wiſhing Reſt to ſuch as they thought to have it*, he means that they had ſo good an Opinion of thoſe they pray'd for, as

to

to think they were already received into Bliſs; he need not play the Antiquary ſo much as to go to the Fourth Age for ſuch Chriſtians as theſe: They may be found in the Seventeenth: We our ſelves [the Catholics of theſe times] are not ſo uncharitable, but that we think that many of our Deceaſed Brethren, whom we recommend to Almighty God in our daily Prayers, are already in the fruition of that Glory which we ſo earneſtly ſollicite for them; but becauſe we do but think ſo, and are not certain of it, we ſtill continue our uſual Interceſſions, leſt poſſibly it may not be ſo well with them as we imagin: And ſo our Charity is exerciſed both ways, as well by offering this Relief to our Friends, as by having ſo good an Opinion of them at the ſame time as to think they need it not. And in this manner St. *Auguſtin* pray'd for his Mother. For tho' (as he ſays himſelf) ſhe lived ſo vertuouſly, that he had reaſon to hope ſhe contracted nothing ſince her Baptiſm which might retard her admiſſion to Eternal Happineſs; yet becauſe, for ought he knew, it might be otherwiſe, he thanks * Almighty God for his Mothers Good Deeds on the one hand, and beſeeches him to pardon ſuch Sins as poſſibly ſhe might have committed on the other. And he is ſo Zealous in this Charitable Employment, that he is not contented to offer up his own Prayers only for this purpoſe, but begs of ſuch as ſhould read his Book of Confeſſions, wherein he gives an Account of theſe things, that they likewiſe would joyn Their Petitions to His:

* Ego itaq; Deus cordis mei, ſepoſitis pauliſper bonis ejus actibus, pro quibus tibi gaudens gratias ago, nunc pro peccatis Matris meæ, deprecor te, &c. *St. Aug. lib. 9. Confeſſ. c. 13.*

That

* *That so* (adds this Holy Bishop) *what my Mother made her last Request to me, may the more plentifully be performed for her by the* Prayers *of Many.*

* Ut quod illa à me poposcit extremum, uberius ei præstetur in multorum *orationibus*. Ibid.

Other parts of this Dedicatory Address might likewise be *reflected* and *read* upon; but I fear that my Lecture is too tedious already: Neither should it have been so long, had I not been willing to shew my Reader what just cause I have to decline the perusal of the whole Book, when a few Lines of Preface afford so much (and so *trivial*) work. Wherefore I shall not stay to examin with what probability of Truth he asserts, *That the Souls of his Sheep are much dearer to him than their Fleeces*, when he seems to be so * loth that any farther Division should be made in the *Fleeces*, tho' for a better Attendance on the *Souls*. Neither will I ask him how he comes in the close of his Letter to call the English Protestant Church * *Apostolical*, as if it came down by perpetual Succession from the *Apostles*, when every body knows (that has not read his Ten thousand pounds worth of Books) that it began in the last Age, and brags of no other Succession than what it pretends to have received from that Church, to which in Truth, and even *according to its own Profession*, it neither *succeeds* in Doctrin nor Discipline. And lastly, whereas the Doctor says, *That the Establish'd Church, so far as he can understand the Temper of it* [which is somewhat difficult for him to do] *had rather suffer Injuries, than do them*: I shall only say, That if this be so, I presume he will give us leave to hope that this *Established* Church will not look on the power of doing those Injuries as part of Her *Establishment*.

* *See above*, p. 17. *& sequ.*

* *I suppose not from Missions.*

And ſo much for the Preface: I come now to what concerns me in the Book.

I am told that Dr. *Teniſon* in the 58th page of his new Book calls me a *Manager in Conference*. And again, page 96. he ſays, *That I am the very Sales-man at every Auction of Arguments.* What the Doctor means by this, I cannot well tell, nor I ſuppoſe He himſelf. Poſſibly it was ſomewhat that came into his Head, whil'ſt the Pen was in his Hand, and down it went at all Adventures. For this was the ſecond Conference I was ever at in my Life, (excepting caſual and unſought Rencounters) and how unwillingly I came to this, I have already given my Readers an Account. It is true that I had like to have been at one or two more in Mr. G.'s Company, had not the Miniſters who were to be his Antagoniſts diſappointed him twice or thrice. But this was before Dr. *St.* had publiſhed his firſt Letter to Mr. G. and ſo given me to underſtand how great an Advantage Latitudinarian Wits have over one (not only much leſs, but alſo) ty'd within the ſtreight Rules of Sincerity. It is true, the Goodneſs of a Cauſe is of great Weight, but the Diſingenuity of an Adverſary is a ſhrewd Counterpoiſe.

Now, I ſay, how my Being at theſe two Conferences (and that accidentally too, and foraſmuch as concerns the latter, very unwillingly) could render me that *Manager*, and *Sales-man at Auctions of Arguments*, which the Doctor's Nick-naming Faculty would make me, I do not perceive. But the Doctor has a Rule for this, as well as for the reſt which he has been pleaſed to beſtow on me, *viz. Calumniare*

lumniare fortiter, aliquid adhærebit, and therefore I shall say no more of it. [And yet it is hard to find out why the Doctor turns that into a Calumny, which fairly represented would be a Commendation. For what could any man do better, who had a Talent proper for it, than employ his time in freeing *Souls* from Error; an Employment for which our Blessed Lord came into the World, and for which his Holy Apostles travelled through it? But I forget that the Retrenchment of *Missions* was one of the most considerable parts of the Reformation.]

However, tho' I have not been at many of these Conferences, yet I will not deny but that I imagin my self to have arrived to some competency of skill in them; and for some proof of this, and because I desire to be communicative in so precious a Talent, I purpose to make my Readers partakers of it, as a Reward of that Patience wherewith they have hitherto endured such tedious and immethodical Discourses, promising my self, that for the sake of this one Treasure only, they will think the rest of their time well bestow'd.

Now, forasmuch as the worse the Cause is, the greater skill is required in the *Management* of it, I will lay down some brief Rules, whereby, as I conceive, an ill Cause may be *managed* in Conference to the best advantage; and so as that the Defender of it (especially if the Hearers be no wiser than some of Dr. *Tenison*'s Parishioners) may come off with great Applause.

Brief Rules how an ill Cause may be manag'd to the best advantage.

First then, let the Scene of your Conference be lay'd amongst your own Friends, and therefore, if the Disputer be a Protestant (and such he must be to

to ſtand in any need of theſe Inſtructions) let it be in a Proteſtant Family. Before the Conference, and the arrival of your Antagoniſt, endeavor to poſſeſs your Favorers with a prejudice againſt him; propheſie ſomething which you are ſure will come to paſs, that when it doth ſo, they may have the better Opinion of you. For Example: Tell them that you are come alone, without ſo much as either Friend or Servant, [when you know that the whole Houſe are your *Friends*, and that none can be readier to *ſerve* you than they are.] And then lay a wager that your Antagoniſt brings ſome one with him, [becauſe you think it imprudent, and therefore unlikely, that he ſhould truſt himſelf to the Reports of your Party, without ſome Witneſs of his own.] But this, as you ſhall word it, muſt argue Confidence in You, and Diffidence in Him. And when you ſhall ſee that he complies with what you thought Reaſonable, turn to your Company, and ſay, *Did I not tell you that he would not come alone?* Be ſure to begin the Conference with that which hath nothing to do with it. Make many Exceptions [at the Company, the Perſons, or ſomewhat elſe] without hearkening to any Accommodations. Let the firſt hours of your Conference be ſpent in ſuch things as theſe, which your Adverſary never thought of, and conſequently is not provided for. This poſſibly may diſturb him ſo as that he will forget his Arguments, at leaſt it will deprive him of that time which would be neceſſary for the carrying them on. [If Writing be propoſed, let it be waved as earneſtly (but as plauſibly too) as may be: but when it cannot be otherwiſe, let the whole Conference be taken up in preliminary and frivolous

 matters,

matters, or at leaſt artificially broken off before any material point be concluded. But in theſe Written Conferences there is little room for after-Miſrepreſentations, and conſequently little Credit to be obtained, and therefore what follows, for the moſt part, has relation only to ſuch as are purely Verbal.]

But now, your firſt Cavils being once weather'd, (which by the by, muſt not be ſo long as you can hinder it) and your Adverſary finding room to propoſe a Queſtion, have a care of returning any Anſwer to it immediately. No, ſuch precipitation would argue a great want of skill; and therefore be ſure to ſtart ſome new thing, offer ſome Objection to your Adverſary, and urge him to ſolve it. And let all this be done as prolixly, and in as many words as your Invention can furniſh: And he is a poor Artiſt that is not able to keep his Adverſaries Queſtion out of ſight for one half hour at leaſt. By this means you may promiſe your ſelf one of theſe two Advantages, *viz.* That either your Adverſary, by anſwering your impertinent Objection, will be diverted from his Point, (and when he is once capable of being ſo, you may deal with him as you pleaſe) or elſe by not anſwering it he will give occaſion to the Pariſhioners to think that you have puzzl'd him.

When the Diverſion will hold no longer, and your Adverſary becomes ſo obſtinate and importune, that, maugre all the fine things you ſay to him to hinder it, he throws out his firſt Queſtion once more, and the Hearers at length ſeem to expect your Anſwer: Here it is that you muſt ſhew your Art. Let your Anſwer be tedious and intricate,

ſeeming

ſeeming *much*, but being *little* to the purpoſe. But when your Anſwer is once given, ſtay for no Reply: Suppoſe that none can be given; and therefore, as if this Queſtion were already become your prize, begin a new Matter; Raiſe ſome notable Objection (as you did before) and ask him what he ſays to it; Make uſe of ſome opprobrious Term; Out with ſome reflecting Tale: Perhaps his Paſſion will be mov'd, and he will think himſelf oblig'd in Honor to defend himſelf againſt theſe New Attacks, and ſo quit his former hold, and then the Day is your own. But if, contrary to your Opinion, his tenaciouſneſs ſhould ſtill continue, yet ſtill you have this advantage: He anſwers not your Objections, and this diſgraces him with the Pariſhioners; and it is ſo long ſince you return'd an Anſwer to his Queſtion, that he knows not what it was, and therefore is forc'd to propoſe his Queſtion a-new. The people are nauſeated with this *Crambe*: You tell him that you have anſwer'd this long ago, and for proof you repeat your Anſwer, with ſome variety of Phraſe; and to avoid Reply, run aſide again, and lead him ſuch another Dance through Cavils, Similitudes, and Tales, as you did before. You have here the whole Method of Diſputation, and you have nothing elſe to do, ſave only to repeat theſe Rounds ſo often 'till the day be gone, the Hearers grow weary, or your Antagoniſt loſe all hope of advancing one ſtep farther.

There are ſome particular ſtrokes of Art which your own Mother-wit will be likely to ſuggeſt as occaſion ſhall be offered. When your Adverſary will not go from his firſt point, be ſure to complain *that he will ſtick to nothing*. Lay a great ſtreſs on trivial

trivial things, and make no account of ſuch as are moſt material. Let the *Rule of Faith* be not worth the naming, and let the Cauſe of both Churches depend upon a ſingle Quotation. Turn frequently from your Adverſary with an Appeal to the Hearers. This wins their Affection, diſturbs your Antagoniſt, and (what ought to be your principal care) is of ſingular Uſe towards the conſumption of time. Place your ſelf between your Adverſary and his Friend, whom you muſt repreſent as his Second; and when the Argument preſſes too much on one ſide, turn to the other, and ſo *vice verſâ*: By which means you ſhift the Diſputation to and fro, as Boys do a live coal from one hand to the other, with ſuch quickneſs that neither is burnt. You may alſo brag, that you have Two Adverſaries, when in Truth you have not ſo much as *One*; for inſtead of *adding* them together to make *Two*, you *ſubſtract* them one from the other; and what remains?

To theſe things may be added the Merriments of ſome Droll, the Applauſe of the Company on the one ſide, and their Rudeneſs on the other, and the like.

When the Conference is ended, call a Council of War; take a View of the Field of Battel; reckon what* *Yellow Perukes, Plain Bands*, and other Enſigns of the Enemy lie there, that ſo you may compute the Number of the Slain, and underſtand the Greatneſs of your Victory: Indict a Triumph; and remember that a Falſe Story differs not in Language from a True one, and for the moſt part men believe as they are affected: And then it is your own fault if the Common Fame be not on your ſide.

* *Sr. D. T.'s Narr.* p. 4.

You

You have here my whole skill in the *Art of Wrangling*; and it is ſo much, that I queſtion not but when I tell you that I learnt it all (in a manner) at one Leſſon, you will conclude either that I am a very apt Scholar, or elſe that I had an excellent Maſter: And for my own part, if this will not ſupport an *ill Cauſe*, I know not what will.

In the laſt of the above-cited places the Doctor repreſents me as one *who love to be engag'd*; and tells me, *that poſſibly ſome or other may oblige me in the Art of Wrangling; but, as for him, he hath Employment more worthy his time.*

It is ſtrange that the Doctor having publicly aſpers'd me at the Conference, and ſince more publicly poſted me up in Print under ſeveral Ignominious Characters, beſides what (I hear) he hath been pleas'd to beſtow on me in his private Converſations, ſhould after all look on it as an *Irregular Appetite to Wrangling* in me, that I ſhould publiſh any thing in my own Vindication. He might have remembred how his Friend Dr. *St.* made the Nation ring with Complaints, becauſe Mr. G.'s Amanuenſis had caſually left out a few words in his Copy, which (for any thing they added to the Senſe) might have been as well * out, as in. Dr. *St.* may do this; but as for me, I muſt be contented to ſit down under the heavieſt Reproaches, on pain of being thought a *Wrangler*. And even in our preſent Caſe Dr. *Teniſon* is the Aggreſſor, and yet Mr. *M. loves to be engag'd*. How high are ſome men carry'd in their own Conceits! They imagin that the whole World was made for them, that as for the reſt they may tread upon them at pleaſure, and if Theſe

* *See the Letter to Dr.* E. S. *pag.* 18.

turn

turn again, (as they ſay *a Worm will do*) the Others are hugely affronted! God deliver us all from this Spirit, which is ſo diametrically oppoſite to that of a Chriſtian!

And here (beſides what I have already ſaid to this purpoſe) I will aſſure the Doctor, That I am far from being a Lover of Controverſie. Had I Time, Health, and other Talents neceſſary for Writing, I ſhould much more willingly employ them on Books of Devotion; and this becauſe I am perſuaded that with moſt men the Will ſtands in more need of being moved, than the Underſtanding of being convinced, at leaſt I believe that when the Firſt is done, the Laſt will ſoon follow. Such Converſions, as I have been more intimately acquainted with, have ever (as far as I could perceive) begun this way. And agreeably hereunto, our Savior generally lays the blame of Unbelief not on any Defect of the Underſtanding, but on the Vices of the Will: * *Light*, ſays he, *is come into the World, and men loved Darkneſs rather than Light, becauſe their Deeds were evil.* And again, *John* 5. 44. (where particularly he notes *Pride* as a principal hindrance of Faith) *How can you believe, who receive Honor one of another, and the Honor which is from God only you ſeek not?* And foraſmuch as concerns even our preſent Heſitations in point of Faith, I queſtion not but they all proceed from the ſame Root. The Hardneſs of Tranſubſtantiation, or ſome other Myſtery may be pretended, but the Real Hindrance is ſomewhat elſe; *ſome foreſeen Perſecution, or other Temporal Inconvenience*; *the Diſpleaſure of Friends*, *the Cenſure of the World*; (if not theſe, yet) *the diſagreeableneſs of Confeſſion and doing Penance*, *the diffi-*

* John 3. 19.

culty of ſome Reſtitution, or of breaking with ſome beloved Vice, the enjoyn'd Celibacy of a leading ſort of Men: Theſe things, I ſay, and ſome others of the like quality, are (in their turns) the ordinary ſource of all our Repugnances againſt Religion. I do not mean that men are generally hindred by ſuch irregular Paſſions from profeſſing what they believe, (tho' it may be feared that this alſo too often happens) but that they are hindred by them from believing what they ought, and what (were it not for ſuch Byaſſes) they would.

Wherefore, if the main (I might ſay only) Obſtacle of true Faith be a perverſeneſs of Will, it follows that ſuch Books as tend to the warming of the Affection are more probable means of Converſion, than ſuch as are directed for the enlightning of the Underſtanding: Not but that Books of Controverſie are uſeful too in their ſeaſon, and thoſe who are qualified for this way of Writing do well in making us Partakers of their Labor, and indeed the Proceedings of our Adverſaries in a manner exact it; but as for me, I am led by Judgment and Inclination to give the preference to Treatiſes of another kind. And therefore thoſe who have taken in that Character which the Doctor is pleaſed to give of me in this place, as if I loved Controverſie, are (if it imports them to know it) much deceived; this being an Art no leſs contrary to my Liking, than it is above my Capacity. But foraſmuch as concerns my preſent Task, I cannot but promiſe my ſelf that the Neceſſity that was put upon me will excuſe the Undertaking, and the Goodneſs of the Cauſe bring me through it.

The

The Doctor (if I mistake him not) threatens to leave me *engag'd* with a new Antagonist. But why should he, who thinks I do too much in taking notice of what himself writes, imagin that another Pen is able to engage me? He seems to think that I might have let Him alone without Disgrace; and what then should oblige me to Combat his Second? On the contrary, it is my opinion, that when such Calumnies are first vented, somewhat is to be done to satisfie the Judicious: but afterwards, when Old Calumnies are defended by New, the best Refutation of them is Contempt. And therefore, unless the Doctor's Second come into the Field with better Weapons than his Principal hath done, I shall leave him an Enemy worthy such a Champion, *viz.* his own Shadow.

And here, tho' I cannot but think it a little hard that the Doctor should begin the War, and then leave me engag'd with fresh Adversaries, unless my Revenues were as well able to hire Auxiliaries as his own; yet I must acknowledge, that his excuse for *not Writing* is so just, that I wonder how he could find any for *Writing*. One would think that two such * Parishes should find him work enough. And certainly, were it not for a singular Art of converting Cures into Sine-cures, I should have heard as little from Dr. *Tenison*, as he would have done from me without a Provocation.

* *Above* p. 17. & sequ.

Dr. *Tenison* (as I am farther inform'd) having said that Mr. P. accuses him of answering nothing to a certain Query that had been put to him, *viz. How the Church of* England, *granting her self to be Fallible (and for ought she knew in actual Error) could*

*Matt. 16. 18. *be the Church built upon a* * *Rock*, &c? hath the following words: *It is much that I had nothing to say upon this Argument, when Mr.* Meredith *may remember, that upon the Objection as made by him, I gave him this Answer, to which he has not yet reply'd; That our Church was no more Fallible than any other in the World; That God's Providence would not suffer all to fail together; That we had a certain Rule, and sufficient means; That we were as infallibly sure of the Necessaries of Faith, as a man is of casting up a Sum right, tho', by Misattention, 'twas possible to commit a mistake; And that our Church could prove, it had rightly computed. This was said to him at the side of the Bed in the second Room, about the close of our Talk.*

Now it is very possible that Dr. *Tenison* might be readier with an Answer to a Query at one time than at another. No man (generally speaking) is always equally present to himself; a Passion may sometimes interpose, and darken the Understanding; and this especially is not to be wondred at in One who has *peculiar Motives to Indignation.* Besides, he might *live* and *learn*, and finding himself puzzl'd *to day*, he might study the point better against *to morrow*; for which reasons it is not impossible but the Doctor might have said nothing to his former Quærist, and yet afterwards say *something* to Me on the same Subject. There is no great Miracle in all this. But that which is truly to be admired is, that he should take that which he said to me for *something*. For my part I do not remember what passed herein at the Conference with distinction enough to be able to relate it, wherefore I shall take it for granted that the Doctor gives us a faithful

faithful Account of the whole Affair; neither indeed is it ſo much for his advantage, that I ſhould ſuſpect a Fraud. What the Doctor ſays of my not replying, is likewiſe extremely probable: I told him at the beginning of the Conference, that I came not as a Diſputant, but an Hearer, and he treated me ever after (and even when he diſputed with me) accordingly, *viz.* as one who was to hear, and not to ſpeak. And in the preſent Caſe, whether it be probable that my ſilence proceeded from the want of a Reply, or of the Liberty of giving it, I ſhall freely leave my Readers to judge, after a ſhort Reflection on the Doctor's words.

The Doctor (it ſeems) had been ask'd how the Church of *England*, granting her ſelf to be Fallible, could be the Church built upon a Rock, *&c. viz.* one that could not fail? To this he ſays, (and calls it an Anſwer) *that their Church is no more* Fallible *than any other in the World.* What trifling is here! The Quæriſt ſuppoſes, that according to Scripture there muſt be an *Infallible Church*, (*viz.* as I have ſaid, one that cannot fail) and that the Church of *England* acknowledges her ſelf to be *Fallible*; and then concludes, by asking, *How that, which by its own Confeſſion is* Fallible, *can pretend to be what is truly Infallible?* The Anſwerer neither tells him (at leaſt plainly) whether there be any Infallible Church, or whether the Church of *England* deny, or own her ſelf to be Fallible, but anſwers like one who knew not what to ſay. *The Church of England*, ſays he, *is no more* Fallible *than any other*; which is as much as to ſay, *She is no more Fallible* than thoſe whom ſhe takes to be in Error. An excellent Security! For whil'ſt he pretends that his Church is

no

no more Fallible than others, he doth not deny it to be *as Fallible as others*. Wherefore the whole Diſcourſe amounts to this: *Gentlemen, here are many Churches that have fallen into Error, and we have been ſo wiſe as to ſeparate from them on this account; and now (for our comfort) we are as* Fallible *as they, and for ought we know may be as much* miſtaken. *But (* proceeds the Doctor*) the Providence of God will not ſuffer* * *all to fail together.* The place of Scripture alluded to by the Querift ſpeaks of *one* Church, whereas the Doctor talks of *ſeveral*. It is true, that this one Church to which this Promiſe of Infallibility is made, conſiſts of divers particular Churches as its Members, and that it is poſſible for any of theſe Members to * fail in Particular, but not for all of them together, and therefore if the Doctor had proved either that *his* Congregation was this whole Infallible Church here ſpoken of, or elſe ſhewn ſome ſuch whole Church whereof the Church of *England* was a Member, he had done his buſineſs. But whereas he does neither of theſe things, the Query continues ſtill without an Anſwer.

* *One would think however*, that the Providence of God had ſuffer'd all *Churches* to fail together, *who ſhould conſider that the Reformers could find none amongſt them with which (if you will believe them) they could joyn with ſafe Conſciences, and ſo were forced to ſeparate from* A L L. *The common Anſwer is, That before the Reformation there were ſome Churches found in* Neceſſaries *of Faith*; *which*, ſay they, *is a ſufficient fulfilling of our Lord's Promiſe of* being always with his Church. *So then, it ſeems, we are aſſured by a Divine Promiſe, that at leaſt ſome Church or Churches were found in* Neceſſaries *before the Reformation: But that a Church* ſeparating from all others, *ſhall be ſo, they do not, they cannot pretend that they have any Promiſe from God, nor other ſecurity than what they receive from a Banquerupt* Enſurer, viz. *their own Preſumption. And this certainly deſerves their moſt ſerious Conſideration.*

* *So far as ſuch Members may fail without the Deſtruction of the Body.*

But

But becauſe what is defective in Strength may be ſupply'd by Number, (according to what I have ſaid * above) out comes another Cypher. *We have* (ſays the Doctor) a certain *Rule, and* ſufficient *Means.* I ſuppoſe the meaning of this is, *That the Scripture is certain,* and I will add in the Name of the Church of *England,* That if we could hit on the right Senſe of it, we ſhould be ſo too: But becauſe we are *uncertain* whether we have this *Right Senſe* or not, notwithſtanding our *certain* Rule, we muſt continue *uncertain*; And then becauſe we have no *means* of knowing when we have this *Right Senſe,* and when we have it not, whatever our means are ſufficient for, they do not *ſuffice* for Certainty. Hitherto we have made but little progreſs; let us therefore make room for what comes next.

* Pag. 64.

We are (adds the Doctor) *as* infallibly *ſure of the Neceſſaries of Faith, as a man is of caſting up a Sum right; tho', by Miſattention, 'twas poſſible to commit a miſtake.* Not to ask the Doctor at preſent, By what Scales he weighs the * Infallibility of the Church of *England,* and finds it neither more nor leſs than a man has in *caſting up a Sum*: Is not what he ſays here alſo as much as to ſay, that they are as *Infallible* as a man that may be miſtaken, which was never (that I know of) deny'd to the Church of *England?* But here I take it for granted (tho' the expreſſion, as well as that which follows, ſeems to be ſomewhat doubtful) that the Dr. does not intend to ſay thus much, *viz. That tho' indeed His Church might be* miſtaken *in caſting up its Sum, were it guilty of* Miſattention, *yet now being aſſured that it is guilty of none, it is impoſſible for it to* miſtake. I ſuppoſe, I ſay, he does

* *I thought the Infallibility of a Church had been from God's Promiſe, and conſequently ſomewhat more than what is meerly natural.*

does not mean this: For if there be no poſſibility of *miſtaking* in this Computation but by *Miſattention*, and the Church of *England* is ſure that it has no *Miſattention* when it computes, it is ſure likewiſe that it is Infallible, becauſe it is ſure by being without *Miſattention* that it is without a poſſibility of miſtaking, which is contrary to the ſuppoſition of the Query, (which was not deny'd by the Doctor) and to the Fallibility which this Church owns of her ſelf. The like muſt be ſaid of that which follows, *viz.* That the Church of *England can prove it hath* rightly *computed.* For if a right Computation be liable to no miſtake, and the Church of *England* can prove that it hath this right Computation, it proves at the ſame time that it is liable to no miſtake, and therefore Infallible. In a word, if what the Doctor ſays imports that his Church is Infallible, I ſay, it is contrary to our ſuppoſition (not deny'd by him) and to her own Profeſſion; and if he underſtands leſs than that, the Query remains, *viz.* *How that which is* leſs *than Infallible, can be that which* cannot *fail?*

And yet how frivolous and unſatisfactory ſoever theſe laſt Poſitions are, I cannot but applaud the Contrivance of them: For could any thing be better calculated for a Vulgar Capacity? *How*! ſays a *Long-Acre*-Artiſan, *am I as ſure that the Proteſtant Religion is true, as I am that I have caſt up a Sum right? Why then I am ſafe enough: I have caſt up many a* Bill, *and have never been* miſtaken *yet, eſpecially when I have taken care. And (it ſeems) this is done without that* ſupernatural *Infallibility which the Papiſts talk of: And therefore what need is there of it?* This is a very pleaſing Deluſion with People who care

care for no more Security in Religion than what will barely ſuffice for the keeping their Conſciences in ſome tolerable Quiet; and the more it pleaſes them, the greater hazzard I ſhall run of their *ill will* by endeavouring to lay it open. However, becauſe I am more intent on doing Benefits to them, than deſirous of receiving any from them, I will ſtate the matter aright, and by that means ſhew them truly how the Caſe ſtands. They ſuppoſe already with the Doctor, *that the finding out of true Religion is like the* caſting up of a Sum, *and that* Seekers *in Faith are of the ſame quality with* Accomptants *in Arithmetic.* And now let them ſuppoſe with me, *that twenty ſeveral* Accomptants *were employ'd about caſting up of the* ſame *Sum, and that the Life of each of theſe in particular depended on his* right Computation; *that theſe Accomptants were of* equal *capacity, and that in outward appearance they all uſed the* ſame *diligence and application; and laſtly, when their reſpective Computations were finiſhed, that their* Totals *were wholly* different *one from the other.* We will now ſuppoſe that the honeſt Artiſan, whom I mention above, is one of theſe Accomptants: *What do you think? would he hold his Life ſecure, whil'ſt he differed in his Computation from Nineteen others, who had every way as* ſufficient means *of being in the* right *as himſelf?* The Application is eaſie: There are Twenty ſeveral Computers in Religion (I might ſay many Twenties) of equal Skill and * Induſtry; Salvation depends on their being in the right; They all differ in their Computations; The Church of *Eng-*

* *I ſay of* equal Induſtry, *that I may ſuppoſe moſt advantageouſly for the Proteſtants. For in truth it cannot be allowed that their Induſtry in Religion is equal to ours: Witneſs our Laborious and Dangerous Miſſions, Penitential Retirements, the general obligation of Confeſſion and doing Penance, with much more which the Proteſtants have diſcarded.*

 land

land is one of these Computers, and it is Nineteen to One that she is in the wrong; and this is all her Security. Let the Lond. Trades-men consider whether they would *trust* Five Pounds on the like. And yet what is That (or indeed their whole Worldly Interest) compared to HEAVEN!

And now what is become of this Famous Answer, which wanted a *Reply*? Was it not truly Froth, which looks like something, but vanishes whil'st it is look'd on? These Gentlemen deal with their Clients, as Nurses do with little Children; bid them hold fast, when they put nothing into their hands; and the poor Infants are so long deceived, 'till their Curiosity, (or some other Appetite) prevails with them to pry into their Treasure.

* *Dr.* St.'s *second Letter to Mr.* G., p. 17.

This was just such another * *Purse* as Dr. *St.* put into Mr. *T.*'s hand. Mr. *T.* desired to know, *Whether the Protestants were* absolutely certain *that they held all the same Doctrin that was taught by Christ and his Apostles?* Dr. *St.* undertook to shew *that they were*; and for proof says, *that there was an absolute* Certainty *for the New Testament from the concurrent Testimony of all Christian Churches, as well Heretical as Orthodox*; which is all he either said at the Conference, or published since in his Letters to Mr. G. to prove *that Protestants held all the same Doctrin that was taught by Christ and his Apostles*; and consequently the *Absolute Certainty* which he delivered to Mr. *T.* was no more than what at the same time he bestow'd on the* Arians (who deny the Godhead of our Savior) and all other Heretics both Ancient and Modern. Of the Arians you may say, *That they are* Absolutely Certain *they hold the same Doctrin that*

* *Note that the Arians & other Heretics take the Scripture for their Rule of Faith, as well as Protestants.*

was taught by Christ and his Apostles, because there is an Absolute Certainty *for the New Testament*; and so of the rest. Wherefore, had Dr. *St.* when he made a Present of this *Absolute Certainty* to Mr. *T.* been so ingenuous as to confess that what he then gave him was no more than what Heretics possessed as well as he, *viz. a Certainty of the New Testament*, I suppose he would not have been so well pleased with it as he seem'd to be. And therefore I would advise him to open his * *Purse* once more, and try what he can discern in it. And if upon a second Computation he finds himself no richer than an Arian, or any other Heretic, I suppose he will return back to the Doctor for a better Legacy. For if we are not as careful in laying up Spiritual Treasures, as we are in gathering Temporal Ones, we may be Rich for a Moment, but we shall be Poor for a whole Eternity. And here, tho' Mr. *T.* hath great Reason to look about him, from what hath been said, (*viz.* that for any thing he learnt at the forementioned Conference he is no surer that he is in the right than an Arian) yet I must tell him, That this is not the worst of his Case, because whil'st Dr. *St.* gives him an *Absolute Certainty* for a part of Scripture from the Universal Testimony or Tradition of Christians with one Hand, he takes it away with the Other, by telling him that Tradition is no Infallible Conveyance of Matters of Faith. For tho' the Doctor endeavors to reconcile this Contradiction in his Second Letter to

* *Mr.* T. *hath the Paper he took at the Conference, and may peruse it at leisure.*

* Page 33. *Where the Dr. raiſes a Miſt by telling us what his Adverſaries hold, that he may keep his own Contradiction out of ſight.*

* Mr. G. yet I will leave it to Mr. *T.* to conſider (provided he promiſe me to take time for it) how well he hath ſucceeded in his Undertaking. *In his next let him ſpeak plainly, and tell us how he himſelf comes to hold,* That Tradition is a Ground of *Abſolute Certainty* for the Scripture, *and yet* no *Infallible Conveyance* in Matters of Faith; *or let him deny that he holds theſe two Propoſitions, or either of them.*

THE CLOSE.

I Have now run through all thoſe parts of both Dr. *Teniſon*'s Pamphlets which I have thought fitting. I am not conſcious to my ſelf of any thing wherein I have dealt unjuſtly by him, ſave only (it may be) in the want of that *Negligence* wherewith he * threatens to *do Juſtice* upon Mr. *P.* Which piece of *Juſtice* if I have been defective in hitherto, I ſhall be a more careful Obſerver of it for the future. Only thus much I judged convenient to be ſaid, that when I ſhall think it reaſonable to ſay leſs, the World may not be miſtaken in the Cauſe of my Silence. A moderate Defence (according to what I have ſaid above) is due to Truth; but when Calumnies

* *See his Epiſt. Ded. to his new Book.*

grow exceſſive, they anſwer themſelves by appearing what they are.

It may be objected, That in ſome places of this rambling Diſcourſe, I deliver my ſenſe ſomewhat more largely than I did at the Conference it ſelf, whereas at firſt I ſeemed to blame ſuch proceeding. What I blamed was, that thoſe who have full Liberty in any Conference of ſpeaking what, and as much as they pleaſe, (eſpecially by way of Argument) ſhould afterwards, when they pretend to give Account of it, render their own Speeches more full and plauſible than they were, and yet repreſent them as truly ſpoken. This, I ſay, is what I blamed: But on the other ſide, when either a man is wholly hindred from Anſwering, or elſe cut ſhort in his Anſwers by the Authority or Rudeneſs of his Adverſary, and when by that means moſt of what he has to ſay remains in *petto*; it is but juſt he ſhould have that freedom in the Preſs, which was denied him at the Conference, provided that whatever is added on any Subject be related not as what was, but as what would have been ſaid, had an Opportunity been given. And this I have taken care of.

I have already told my Readers after what manner Dr. *Teniſon* dealt with me at the Conference. He made his Applications to me as often and as fully as he thought fit, excepting only when I withdrew to avoid them: But as for me, I was to ſpeak no longer than he pleaſed, (I muſt confeſs a moſt effectual way of *ſilencing*) ſometimes not a word, ſometimes a few, but never ſo many as were needful. Neither is this the firſt time that I have made this Complaint: I did it at the Conference;

and

and particularly, the Doctor may remember, I told him there was no poſſibility of proſecuting any Argument, ſo long as he ſpoke all, and heard nothing. I added, that this indeed became a *Doctor*, but not a *Diſputant*: My meaning was, That it was proper for one who was *Teaching*, but not for one who was in the *diſagreeable Employment* of *Defending* and *Proving*.

But tho' the Doctor's Interruptions were remarkable enough in all his Diſcourſes with me, yet they ſeemed to be more than ordinary a little before the concluſion of our Conference: For when I perceived that our Diſputations had no other viſible effect than the embittering of minds, and a farther alienating of affections, I thought it not amiſs, before we took our leaves, to offer ſomething that might tend to the calming and re-ſettling of our Spirits, that ſo, tho' we came to no Agreement in our Religion, we might yet *at leaſt* part Friends and Well-wiſhers to one another. As ſoon as I opened my Mouth for this purpoſe, the Doctor immediately ſtopt it: Not a word muſt paſs. *Sir*, ſaid I, *I am not going to Diſpute, but only to take my leave, and would offer a word that it may be amicably.* No, it muſt not be; the Doctor is inexorable; and tho' I attempted it three or four times, it was impoſſible for me to get above three words over without an Interruption. Whether it were that the Doctor (out of his great propenſity to * *ſuſpicion*) ſuſpected that I would put an Argument upon him in diſguiſe, or for ſome other reaſon, I cannot yet tell: But I deſpaired of prevailing with him, and ſo gave over my importunity.

* *Ep. to his Pariſh. in his firſt Book.*

What

What I ſhould have ſaid (had it been allow'd me) was to this effect, That I could not perceive our Meeting had been to any great purpoſe; That I would not then diſpute on whoſe ſide the fault lay, much leſs who were in the right, and who in the wrong, as to Religion; That I deſired we might, notwithſtanding the difference of our Opinions, live peaceably together; only at preſent I would intreat them to conſider, that whil'ſt they imagined the Catholics to be Miſtaken, they themſelves were but Men, and conſequently as liable to Error as their Neighbors; and therefore I would adviſe them in ſo important a Point as That whereon their Eternal Salvation depended, that they would have recourſe to Almighty God, and earneſtly beſeech him, *That if they were in the right, he would confirm them in it; but if in the wrong, that he would bring them to the right.* This is all I would have ſaid, and this (upon the word of a Chriſtian) I was not permitted to ſay; which I think is ſufficient to ſhew of what nature the Doctor's Interruptions were.

But what I had no leave to ſay at the Conference, I ſpeak here; and the liberty of doing it makes ſome amends for all that trouble I have had, and all thoſe pains I have taken on this occaſion: And could I be ſure that my Counſel would be followed, I ſhould deſire no farther Reward. Wherefore I earneſtly exhort my Proteſtant Readers, That for an Eſtabliſhment in the true Faith they would make their chief Applications to Almighty God, whoſe * *Gift* it is. Should I ſend them to Catholic Prieſts, their Prejudices might perhaps make them think it unreaſonable; ſhould I ſend

* *Epheſ.* 2. 8.

I ſend them to their own Miniſters, they might ſuſpect a *Gubbard*, [or Papiſt in Maſquerade] and at beſt could hope but for a Fallible Director; ſhould I ſend them to the Scripture, what would it * profit them, ſo long as they carry with them their own Fallible Interpretation? Laſtly, ſhould I ſend them to Controverſial Treatiſes, they might complain of their tediouſneſs and intricacy: I ſay, ſhould I ſend them to any of theſe things, they might find ſomewhat to be afraid of. But what Apprehenſions can they have, when I ſend them to Almighty God? This is an Advice wherein there can be no danger but in not following it.

* *Unleſs by ſome plain Texts they are directed to an Infallible Interpreter, as indeed they might be.*

Wherefore (my dear Country-men) I hope that you will neither hearken to the Suggeſtions of Pride on the one hand, as if you needed not God's Aſſiſtance; nor to thoſe of Sloth on the other, as if earneſt and perſevering Prayer were too dear a Purchaſe of it; but that fixing your Eye on that ETERNITY which lies at ſtake, you will deſpiſe whatſoever either by Flatteries or Threatnings ſhall ſtrive to divert you from ſo neceſſary an Undertaking. I do not ſay that other means are to be neglected, but I affirm that our chiefeſt Confidence is to be placed in This: And this is always to be put in practice, that our other Induſtries (whatſoever they be) may not prove ineffectual.

And laſtly, when by following this Counſel you ſhall arrive at a ſolid and immovable Faith, as I queſtion not but you will, if you perſevere in your Pious Negotiation with ſuch Sincerity and Diligence as are requiſite to ſo Important a Buſi-

neſs;

neſs; I beg of you that you would employ ſome of thoſe Prayers on My Behalf, which you have found ſo Beneficial to your ſelves, That as God has led me ever ſince my Converſion through many other kinds of Adverſities with Safety, ſo now he would vouchſafe to aſſiſt me under this new Load of Calumny, which his Providence (always-Good) hath permitted to be laid upon me; giving me Grace to bear it as I ought, and to Thoſe who impoſe it, as much Felicity as I wiſh to my ſelf; and both to Them and Me (if it ſhall ſo pleaſe his Divine Goodneſs) a joyful Reconciliation on Earth, and an Eternal Union in Heaven.

Edward Meredith.

THE POSTSCRIPT,

In Answer to the Pamphlet put forth by the

Schoolmaster of *Long-Acre*.

AS for the Schoolmaster, (who has made my Name his Captive, and carried it, as I suppose, in Triumph to the *Pastry*-men long before now) I shall say as little to his Insincerities in Print, as, he says, I did to his Arguments at the Conference: For tho' he has grossly Misrepresented me, yet at the same time he has given the World so just a Representation of himself, that his *Misrepresentation* is like to do me little harm.

He seems to be a man (as far as may be guessed by his Work) so equally composed of *Insincerity* and *Ignorance*, that it is hard to tell which Ingredient has the advantage; tho' for his sake I am willing to give it to the latter.

He represents me as one who several times interrupted Dr. *T.* in his Disputation with Mr. *P.* A thing utterly false, and what Dr. *T.* himself (whose Charity has not greatly appeared in *covering* our Faults) never complain'd of. Nay, on the contrary, he confesses in his 6th page, That when Mr. *P.* had ask'd him a Question, he turned from him before he would answer it, and expresly apply'd himself to me.

He uses the same Ingenuity in the Account he gives of his two Discourses with me conerning *Images* and *Confession*; which I shall endeavor to set right as briefly as I can.

The first of *Images* passed in this manner: He had brought several of the common Sophistries against the Use and Veneration of Holy *Images*, and receiv'd Answers to them all. At length he urges, *That it would be a Dishonor to God,*

God, who is Infinite, to be repreſented by an Image, which is Finite. I replied, That his Argument was ſtark naught; for by the ſame Reaſon we ought not ſo much as to *think* of Almighty God, for we being *Finite* our ſelves, and all our Faculties, we could make no other Repreſentation of him in our Thoughts but what was *Finite*. *Ay but*, ſays he, *the nearer we come to the Nature of God, the better*. *That*, I told him, brought on a new Queſtion, [*viz.* Whether the Repreſenting of God by an *Image* were remoter from his Nature than ſuch other Repreſentations as are uſed?] but as for what he then affirmed (*viz.* That God being Infinite, ought not to be repreſented by any thing that was Finite) he might perceive that it was altogether falſe. My intention was to let him ſee the Error of one Notion, before I proceeded to undeceive him in another; ſince otherwiſe our Diſputation would ſerve for no other purpoſe than making a noiſe. I cannot tell whether the Schoolmaſter underſtood what I meant by this Anſwer, or not; but he replied nothing.

He ſeemed to me by his Behavior to be very ſelf-conceited, and therefore I took it for granted that it would be in vain to endeavor the convincing him by Argument, unleſs I could firſt perſuade him that it was *poſſible* for thoſe lofty Imaginations of his to be deceived. But becauſe I concluded he had too good an Opinion of his own abilities to humble himſelf before Men, I counſelled him to do it in the Preſence of God, conſidering that (whatever he might fancy) he was really no better than his Fellow-Creatures; and if he thought others *Miſtaken*, he might, for ought he knew, be ſo himſelf. I added ſomewhat more of the ſame nature, much according to that which (as I ſay above) I had deſigned to have ſpoken at my parting with Dr. *Temſon*. He ſeem'd to be well pleaſed with what I ſaid, and thanking me for it (as he ſays himſelf) went his way.

Whereas had he returned with his laſt Argument againſt *Images*, (*viz.* That we ought to come as near as may be to the Nature of God in our Repreſentations of him) *That* alſo might have been anſwered as eaſily as any of the reſt: For tho' it may be granted that our Thoughts

are immaterial, and therefore more proportionable Repreſentations of an immaterial Being, yet when we communicate our Thoughts, (*viz.* theſe Mental Repreſentations) to Others, we are forced to make uſe of Material things: Of Air, when we ſpeak; of Ink, or the like Matter, when we write; of Wood, Stone, *&c.* when Letters are carved or engraven; Laſtly, of the ſame Materials, when we ſignifie theſe Thoughts by Holy Signs or Images. Now, ſince all theſe ways of Repreſenting conſiſt of material things, it cannot be ſaid that one of them comes nearer to the Divine Nature than another. Neither indeed is it of any importance which way the Repreſentation be made, provided that *which way ſoever it be made*, the * Repreſentation be ſtill the ſame; and therefore when an Holy Sign or Image brings into my mind the ſame Thoughts concerning God which are brought by Words ſpoken or Written, that Repreſentation by an Image cannot be ſaid to be farther from his Nature, than this by Words; the Repreſentation (or that which is conveyed to the Mind) from both being perfectly the ſame. And therefore, when that Symbolical Figure (uſed by Proteſtants as well as Catholics) of a *Triangle* awakens in me the ſame Notion which the word *Trinity* would do, how comes there to be a greater diſtance between the *Figure* and the Notion to which it correſponds, than there is between the ſame Notion and the *Word*; the one doing the ſame thing by the Eye, which the other does by the Ear?

* Viz. *That which is communicated to the Mind.*

And if (as hath been ſaid) the Repreſentation by Images is the ſame with that by words, there is no more reaſon why the Church ſhould deprive her ſelf of the Former, than of the Latter, eſpecially when ſhe may ſpeak to her Children by Images in thoſe places, (*viz.* in High-ways, Markets, private Houſes, and the like) where ſhe has no opportunity of doing it by Words, at leaſt to ſuch as cannot or have not the time or will to read Inſcriptions. And even in thoſe places which are ſet apart for Sermons or other Verbal Inſtructions or Exhortations, the Church hath no other way of perpetuating theſe Inſtructions and Ex-

Exhortations, but by Images, which are her conſtant * Preachers and Catechiſts, and ſpeak as often as they are look'd upon. Wherefore, to conclude, ſince Thought is the root of Action, the removal of things ſo proper for the inſpiring us with good Thoughts can be eſteem'd no other than a Stratagem of the Devil, who is ſure of keeping Goodneſs from our Works, ſo long as he can keep it from our Minds. And if we conſider what kind of Pictures have ſucceeded to theſe Pious Ones in many Cabinets, we ſhall have little cauſe to doubt on whoſe inſtigation the firſt Poſſeſſors were diſplaced.

* *The Doctrins of the Bleſſed* Trinity, *of the* Incarnation, Life, *and* Paſſion *of our Lord; as alſo the Conſideration of* Death, Judgment, Hell, Heaven, *&c. being oftentimes brought to our minds as movingly by Images, as by the moſt Eloquent Preachers.*

It may be objected, That foraſmuch as concerns Symbolical Figures, or any Repreſentation of God by an Image, it is probable they will miſguide the leſs-knowing, by making them think that God is ſuch in Shape, or ſome other Finite Quality as they find in the Picture. To which I anſwer, That there is no more danger of this, than there is that the ſame Perſons ſhould be miſguided by reading thoſe places of Holy Writ where God is repreſented as having *Eyes*, *Hands*, *Feet*, and the like. The Schoolmaſter perhaps will tell me, That ſuch Expreſſions as theſe are Metaphorical, and not Literal; and that the common People are taught to underſtand them ſo: And he muſt give me leave to tell him in return, That they have a like Leſſon with us in reſpect of the forementioned Images, and the ſame care that prevents their miſtaking in one Caſe, will do it in the other.

So much for the Schoolmaſter's firſt Diſcourſe. His ſecond was concerning the Secrecy of Confeſſion, and much of the ſame ſtrain with the former.

He asked me, Whether if Treaſon ſhould be diſcovered to a Prieſt in Confeſſion, he were bound to reveal it? I told him, No; but on the contrary not to reveal it. I added, That tho' the ſecrecy of this Sacrament might ſeem at firſt ſight (and particularly in this Caſe) to be prejudicial to the

the Commonwealth, yet in Truth it was not ſo at all, but rather very profitable. The firſt, becauſe the Commonwealth loſes no Diſcoveries by it; for were it not for this obligation of Secrecy, Traytors would own their Crimes no more to Prieſts, then they would do to other Men, *that is*, not at all, unleſs they intended to make a Diſcovery, or hoped to find a Fellow-Conſpirator. The ſecond, becauſe where there is ſuch Security of Confeſſion, it is probable that ſome of theſe Criminals, either through ſome remorſe of Conſcience, or ſome imperfect deſire of diſengaging themſelves, may diſcloſe their Conſpiracies to Prieſts, and thereby give them opportunities of dehorting them from ſuch Villanous Undertakings, of encouraging them to ſuch Diſcovery as ſhall be neceſſary for the prevention of the Miſchief, by ſhewing them how they may do it with ſafety, and helping them in it, and laſtly, (when no ſuch Diſcovery can be obtained from their falſe Penitents) of doing all thoſe things towards the hindring of theſe evil Deſigns, which may be done without the violation of this Truſt. Theſe certainly are great Advantages, and ſuch as the Commonwealth would be deprived of, were it not for the ſecrecy of Confeſſion.

The Schoolmaſter ſaid, *That Traytors muſt needs receive great encouragement from ſuch Confeſſions towards the Proceeding in their Treaſon*; which was ſo abſurd a Notion, that, I muſt confeſs, I took my Antagoniſt to be ſomewhat unſound in his Intellectuals, and therefore thought it would be but loſs of time to have any farther diſcourſe with him. For what encouragement could he think it to be, for the going on in one Crime to commit another, unleſs this ſecond ſhould ſome way conduce towards the carrying on of the firſt? What comfort can a Traytor have by adding Sacrilege (as his approach to this Sacrament without *Repentance* would be) to his Treaſon? What new Incentives to Villany can ſuch a Miſcreant receive from thoſe Dehortations and Menaces which a good Prieſt ought to denounce againſt him on the part of Almighty God, if he perſiſt in his Wicked Undertaking? Laſtly, What an odd encouragement muſt it be in a Conſpiracy to diſcloſe it to

one

one who (as the Conſpirators ought to think) will be ſure to hinder the Deſign, as far he ſhall be able to do it without diſcovering the Perſons? I do not ſay but this Sacrament may be abuſed as well as others; but I think that the Schoolmaſter has hit on one of the moſt fantaſtical ways of abuſing it that ever could come into any man's Imagination. And yet, if any one ſhould have his Brain ſo ſtrangely turned as to receive an encouragement in his Treaſon by Confeſſing it, as the Schoolmaſter ſuppoſes; a good Inſtitution is not to be laid aſide, becauſe there is a Mad-man in the World.

You have here a true ſtate of both my Diſcourſes with this famous Gentleman. How he has Miſrepreſented me in both. you may ſee, if you think it worth the while, by comparing my Relation with his: But for my part, I do not owe you ſo ill a turn, as that I ſhould tranſcribe ſo much of him as is neceſſary for it; eſpecially ſince it will be needful for me to trouble you with ſome fragments of his *Diſcourſe* by and by.

So much for the Inſincere part of this Paper, *viz.* its *Miſpreſentations*. I come now to the Ignorance of it, which is in ſo great a proportion, that, I confeſs, I have ſome ſcruple for laying any part of the blame on *Want of Sincerity*, when the Ignorance, as it appears to me on ſecond thoughts, would have been ſufficient to have born the Whole.

And in this point (according to what I intimated juſt now) I ſhall leave the Schoolmaſter to ſpeak for himſelf, ſince none can do it more to purpoſe. The good qualities of his Paper are conſpicuous enough without a Commentator, and he that runs may read them. Only I ſhall add a few Notes, for the ſake of ſuch as (my Acquaintance with this Author convinces me) there are amongſt us. And *we are Debtors* (as I obſerved * formerly) *both to the Wiſe, and to the Unwiſe*: And this being a Debt of Charity, we owe the moſt where moſt is needed.

* *See about*, p. 64. *& ſequ.*

The

The Schoolmaſter ſpeaking, *How Mr. P. had told him, That ſeeing God had appeared to* Daniel *in the ſhape of an Old Man, he might be pictur'd, ſo that we meant not to delineate him* ſub Specie propriâ, hath theſe following words: *To this* A. C. *anſwered, (which our Adverſary hath concealed) That as for the Text before us, what this Prophet ſaw, was only in a Viſion, which was a Repreſentation of God's coming to Judgment, and fitted only to that particular Occaſion, and therefore ought not to be proſtituted to all Intents and Purpoſes whatſoever.* Who ſays (I pray) that ſuch Repreſentations of Almighty God ought to be *proſtituted* to all Intents and Purpoſes whatſoever? Let the Schoolmaſter conſider for what *Intents and Purpoſes* this Viſion is recorded by the Holy Ghoſt, and why the Hiſtory of it is ſo often * read in our Churches, and then perhaps he will diſcern for what *Intents and Purpoſes* ſuch Repreſentations are uſed by Catholics. But, ſays our ſubtil Diſputant, *That was a Repreſentation of God's coming to Judgment, and fitted only to that particular Occaſion.* As if God might be repreſented as *coming to Judgment*, but not as governing the World, pardoning Sinners, or in any other Divine Action, and as if the Shape of an *Old Man*, wherein he was repreſented by that Viſion, hath by Nature a greater relation to his *coming to Judgment*, than to any other of thoſe Works which I have mentioned. And this is the TREASURE which the Schoolmaſter complained that Mr. *P.* had concealed from the World.

* *The Hiſtory of this Viſion is permitted to be read by private perſons, as often, and for ſuch* Intents & Purpoſes *as they please.* Will the Schoolmaſter ſay that it is *proſtituted?*

He goes on; *And then for the Lawfulneſs of Repreſenting God, provided it was not meant to do it* ſub Specie propriâ, A. C. *anſwers now, (he confeſſes he did not anſwer to this laſt part of the Objection at the Conference) Any one may ſee (if he will but take a little pains) the vanity of this diſtinction; for if God's Image be not given us* ſub Specie propriâ, *with relation to his own Eſſence, 'tis no more the Image of God, but the Sign of his Power which is repreſented in the above-mentioned Chapter of* Daniel; *His Throne was like the fiery flame,* &c. *But ſuppoſe all our Diſputant ſays were true, what comfort could it be to a poor Soul, who is charged with diſhonoring God,*

who

who is Infinite, by repreſenting him by an Image that is Finite, and terminated by Viſible Dimenſions, to be told by Mr. P. That he does not diſhonor God, becauſe he hath no intention to repreſent him, ſub Specie propriâ? What think you, does this famous piece of Logic need a Comment? *If God's Image*, ſays he, *be not given us* ſub Specie propriâ, *with relation to his own Eſſence, 'tis no more the Image of God, but the Sign of his Power, which is repreſented in the above-mentioned Chapter of* Daniel. Mighty ſubtil! If that which is exhibited by Catholics, as God's Image not *ſub Specie propriâ*, be not God's Image, as the Gentleman ſays, why are we accuſed for making God's Image? But if it be, then the Gentleman is in the wrong. However it is to be underſtood that ſuch a Repreſentation is not God's Image properly, (for ſo much is meant by our ſaying that it is not *ſub Specie propriâ*) but Symbolically, or in the Nature of a Sign, as he himſelf ſpeaks, without underſtanding what he ſays.

But the Repreſentation in Daniel's *Viſion was a Sign of God's Power, and not of his Eſſence.* A little above it was a Repreſentation of *God's coming to Judgment*; now, it ſeems, it is not of *God's* coming, but of his *Power's* coming. This will be fine ſenſe by and by.

Beſides, how comes God's *Power* to be more capable of being repreſented than his *Eſſence?* Are not both *Infinite* alike; and therefore what diſhonors the One, will it not be an equal diſreſpect to the Other? Wherefore if the Schoolmaſter allow that God's *Power* may be ſignified by an Image, he muſt not deny but that his *Eſſence* may. But indeed there is nothing *in* God but what *is* God, and therefore his *Power* and his *Eſſence* are the ſelf-ſame thing. Had our Diſputant's Divinity reach'd ſo far, it might eaſily be imagin'd that he would not have endeavored to evade this Inſtance of *Daniel's Viſion* by telling us that God's *Power* was repreſented there, but not his *Eſſence*.

But ſuppoſe, quoth he, *all our Diſputant ſays were true, what comfort could it be to a poor Soul who is charged with diſhonoring God, who is Infinite, by repreſenting him by an Image that is Finite, and terminated by Viſible Dimenſions, to be told*

by Mr. P. *that he does not diſhonor God, becauſe he hath no intention to repreſent him* ſub Specie propriâ? Mr. *P.* ſays, It is lawful to repreſent God by an Image, provided it be not meant *ſub Specie propriâ*: Wherefore *if all the* Schoolmaſter's *Diſputant ſays be true*, what diſcomfort could it be to a *poor Soul* to do ſo? And why does the Schoolmaſter beg the Queſtion, by ſuppoſing (without proof) *that a poor Soul will be charg'd with diſhonoring God, for repreſenting him by an Image?* As for his *Infinite* and his *Finite* I have ſpoken to them already.

A word or two more, and the Schoolmaſter ſhall hold his peace: For *becauſe* A. C. *ſaid not this* [*viz.* what is here repeated] *at the Conference, he does intend to add but one word or two more. And* firſt, *That he might here obſerve, that if it were granted that we might picture each of the Three Perſons of the B. Trinity apart; That this could be no Argument at all for its reſembling it* (*the Trinity*) *becauſe ſuch reſemblances do not only make Three Perſons, but Three Gods; ſuch Images as theſe repreſent not only a Diſtinction of Perſons, but a Diverſity of Subſtance. I leave our Jeſuit to think of this.* I believe this Philoſopher is ſhrewdly puzzl'd when he looks on ſome of our Sheet-Almanacs: On his right hand he ſees an *Old man with Wings*, and on his left a *Serpent biting his Tail.* He is told that the firſt is a Symbol of Time, the ſecond of a Year. Now by deep Speculation he diſcerns that Time is a meer Accident, and that a Year is nothing elſe but ſuch a parcel of Time, and conſequently as much an Accident as the former, or rather the ſelf-ſame with it. Next he ponders how theſe two things (*viz.* the *Old man* and the *Serpent*) which are brought to ſignifie Time and a Year, do repreſent two living Creatures, and conſequently do not exhibit Accidents only (which is what they ought to do) but even Subſtances alſo, and this is to *out-run the Conſtable.* To conclude, he either blames the Painters, (as I ſuppoſe) or knows not what to make of the buſineſs. *I leave him to think of this*; and I promiſe my ſelf that when he has found out the Myſtery, as alſo how the Appearances of Bodies repreſent Angels who have none, and how the Vertues, Vices, Death, Eternity, (where by the way he may

may note that an Infinite is repreſented by a Finite) and ſuch-like things are painted: when, I ſay, he has diſcover'd all this, I queſtion not but he will begin to underſtand how a *Trinity of Perſons* may be ſignified by a Figure without any neceſſity that ſuch Figure ſhould alſo ſignifie a *Trinity of Subſtances*. Such *Signs* as theſe, (tho' they have ſome Foundation in Nature) are of the quality of *Words*, and ſignifie juſt as men agree they ſhall.

And now having diſſipated the Schoolmaſter's Sophiſtry, it will be an harder Task to defend my ſelf for having taken any notice of him. Indeed I had fully purpoſed to have left him in the quiet poſſeſſion of all that Glory he had obtained (*at leaſt* in fancy) by his Pamphlet; but eſpying the Name of my Lord Archbiſhop's Chaplain in his Title-page, I thought I could do no leſs than accept of him for an Enemy whom ſo great a Perſon had thought worthy of being a Champion. But what reſpect I have now paid to this Gentleman's Name, I hope he will have for it himſelf for the future, and not prefix it where it is ſo little for his Credit; otherwiſe I ſhall think my Complement very ill beſtow'd, and have juſt occaſion of forbearing it another time.

F I N I S.

ADVERTISEMENT.

NOt having Dr. Jackſon's *Works by me whilſt I penn'd what the Reader finds in my* 41th. *page, I am afraid on ſecond thoughts, that the obſcurity wherewith Dr.* T. *quoted a paſſage out of that Author may have miſled me; ſo that whereas I imagined his meaning to be,* That the Church of *England* was in the Church of *Rome* before *Luther*, and ſtill continues in it; *I begin to think he only means,* That it was in the Church of *Rome* before *Luther, and nothing more. It matters not much which way ſoever he means. However even this latter meaning is ſufficient for my purpoſe in that place: For if this Church of* England, *whoſe* Being *we enquire after, were in the Church of* Rome *before* Luther, *it muſt be in it ſtill; becauſe a Church holding Communion with* Rome *cannot be the ſame with one ſeparating from it; and therefore if the Church of* England *acknowledge her ſelf to be ſeparated from the Church of* Rome, *ſhe cannot be the ſame with that which held Communion with it, and conſequently it muſt not be ſaid,* That ſhe was in the Church of *Rome* before *Luther, ſince ſhe is not the* ſame *with that which was ſo; for, at leaſt, this preſent Church of* England differs *from that former one by her* Separation, *whatever ſhe doth otherwiſe.*